



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 13]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, मार्च 31, 1973/चैत्र 10, 1895

No. 13]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MARCH 31, 1973/CHAITRA 10, 1895

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके

Separate paging is given to this part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गये विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities
(other than the Administration of Union Territories)

मंत्रिमण्डल सचिवालय
(कार्मिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 20 मार्च, 1973

CABINET SECRETARIAT
(Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 20th March, 1973

का. आ. 928.—जांच आयोग अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 60) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारत के राजपत्र—असाधारण—भाग 2—खण्ड 3—उपखण्ड (2), में प्रकाशित, भारत सरकार, मंत्रिमण्डल सचिवालय (कार्मिक विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या 375/31/71-ए. वी. डी.-3 (का. आ. 3863), दिनांक 16 अक्टूबर, 1971 में एतद्वारा निम्नीलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना के पैरा 2 में “31 मार्च, 1973 तक” शब्दों, अंकों और अक्षरों के स्थान पर “31 दिसम्बर, 1973 तक” शब्द, अंक और अक्षर प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे।

[सं. 381/21/71-ए.वी.डी.-3]

यु. सी. अग्रवाल, संयुक्त सचिव

(1417)

S.O. 928.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952 (60 of 1952), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Cabinet Secretariat (Department of Personnel) No. 375/31/71-AVD. III (S.O. 3863), dated the 16th October, 1971, published in the Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated the 16th October, 1971, namely:—

In paragraph 2 of the said notification, for the words, figures and letters “by the 31st March, 1973”, the words, figures and letters, “by the 31st December 1973” shall be substituted.

[No. 381/21/71-AVD. III]

U. C. AGARWAL, Joint Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1973

का० प्रा० १२९.—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद ३०९ के परन्तुक और अनुच्छेद १४८ के खंड (५) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय मिथिल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम, १९६५ में और संशोधन करने के लिये पत्रद्वारा निम्नलिखित नियम बनाने हैं, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का नाम केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) संशोधन नियम, 1973 है।
(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।
2. केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम, 1965 की अनुसूची में, भाग V में, निम्नलिखित संशोधन किए जाएंगे :—
- | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|
| (1) | * | * | * | * |
|-----|---|---|---|---|
- (2) क्रम सं० 1 (ख) (XII) और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् क्रमशः निम्नलिखित क्रम सं० और प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएंगी, अर्थात् :—
- | | | |
|--------------------------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|
| “(XIII) महानिदेशक, अनुसंधान और विकास संगठन | राष्ट्रपति | महानिदेशक, अनुसंधान (1) से (4)” और |
| | | विकास संगठन |
- (3) क्रम सं० 2-(ख) के अन्तर्गत क्रम सं० (1) और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर क्रमशः निम्नलिखित क्रम सं० और प्रविष्टियाँ रखी जाएंगी, अर्थात् : —

“(1) जनरल स्टाफ शाखा

1	2	3	4
(क) बख्तरबंद कोर, प्रादेशिक सेवा और रक्षा सुरक्षा कोर निदेशालय।	उपाध्यक्ष, सेना स्टाफ	उपाध्यक्ष, सेवा स्टाफ	सभी
(ख) सैनिक खुफिया निदेशालय	निदेशक, सैनिक खुफिया	निदेशक, सैनिक खुफिया	सभी
(ग) स्टाफ ड्यूटी निदेशालय (अर्थात् मुख्यालय संघटन और स्टेशन स्टाफ कार्यालयों में ऐसे सिविलियनों द्वारा, जो किसी सेना/सर्विस/कोर के संख्या-बल में के नहीं हैं, भरे गए पद)	निदेशक, स्टाफ ड्यूटी	निदेशक, स्टाफ ड्यूटी	सभी
(घ) सैनिक प्रशिक्षण निदेशालय	(1) निदेशक, सैनिक प्रशिक्षण (ट्रिगेडियर और उससे कम की पंक्ति के अधिकारियों द्वारा समायोजित निम्नतर संघटनों में) (2) कमांडेंट (मेजर जनरल) रक्षा सेवा स्टाफ कालेज, राष्ट्रीय रक्षा अकादमी, भारतीय सैनिक अकादमी और इन्फैंट्री (पेदल सेना) स्कूल	(1) निदेशक, सैनिक प्रशिक्षण (ट्रिगेडियर और उससे कम की पंक्ति के अधिकारियों द्वारा समायोजित निम्नतर संघटनों में) (2) कमांडेंट (मेजर जनरल) रक्षा सेवा स्टाफ कालेज, राष्ट्रीय रक्षा अकादमी, भारतीय सैनिक अकादमी और इन्फैंट्री पेदल सेना) स्कूल	सभी
(ङ) तोपखाना निदेशालय	निदेशक, तोपखाना	निदेशक, तोपखाना	सभी
(च) सिग्नल निदेशालय	सिग्नल मुख्य अधिकारी	सिग्नल मुख्य अधिकारी	सभी।"

[सं. 7/9/72-स्था. (ए)]

एस० कृष्णन, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 21 March, 1973

S. O. 929—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309, and clause (5) of article 148, of the Constitution, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Amendment Rules, 1973.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the schedule to the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules 1965, in part V, the following amendments shall be made:—
- (1) against Serial No. 1(b)(i), in column 2, for the words 'Generals' Staff Branch' the words 'General Staff Branch' shall be substituted;
- (2) after Serial No. 1(B) (xii) and the entries relating thereto, the following serial No. and entries shall respectively be substituted; namely:—
- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| (xiii) Director General Research and Development Organisation | President | Director General and Development | Research (i) to (iv)" |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|

- (3) under Serial No 2-B, for Serial No. (i) and the entries relating thereto, the following Serial Number and entries shall respectively be substituted, namely:—

“(i) General Staff Branch

(a) Armoured Corps, Territorial Army and Defence Security Corps Directorates,	Deputy Chief of the Army Staff.	Deputy Chief of the Army Staff.	All
(b) Military Intelligence Directorate	Director of Military Intelligence	Director of Military Intelligence	All
(c) Staff Duties Directorate i.e. posts in Headquarter formation and Station Staff Offices manned by civilians who are not borne on the strength of any Arm/Service/Corps.	Director of Staff Duties	Director of Staff Duties	All
(d) Military Training Directorate	(1) Director of Military Training (in lower formations commanded by officers of the rank of Brigadier and Below) (2) Commandants (Major General) of Defence Services Staff, College, National Defence Academy, Indian Military Academy and Infantry School	(1) Director of Military Training (in lower formations commanded by officers of the rank of Brigadier and Below) (2) Commandants (Major General) of Defence Services Staff College, National Defence Academy, Indian Military Academy and Infantry School	All
(e) Artillery Directorate	Director of Artillery	Director of Artillery	All
(f) Signals Directorate	Signal Officer-in-Chief	Signal Officer-in-Chief.	All

[No. 7/9/72-Ests.(A)]

S. KRISHNAN, Deputy Secy.

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

आवज्ञा

नई दिल्ली, 17 फरवरी, 1973

का. आ. 930.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए हरयाणा विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 79 रोड़ी निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री अमीर चन्द, निवासी ग्राम व पो. आ. फिरोजाबाद, तहसील सिरसा, जिला हिसार (हरयाणा), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री अमीर चन्द का संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरीहृत घोषित करता है ।

[सं. हर.वि.स./79/72(2)]

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

ORDER

New Delhi, the 17th February, 1973

S.O. 930.—WHEREAS the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Amir Chand, R/o Village and P.O. Ferozabad, Tehsil Sirsa, District Hissar (Haryana) who was a contesting candidate for election to the Haryana Legislative Assembly from 79-Rori constituency held in March, 1972, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Amir Chand to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. HN-LA/79/72(2)]

आवज्ञा

नई दिल्ली, 24 फरवरी, 1973

का. आ. 931.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए हरयाणा विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 2 नारायनगढ़ निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री बलबन्त, ग्राम नांगवान, पो. आ. एवं तहसील नारायनगढ़, जिला अम्बाला (हरयाणा), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951

तथा तद्धान बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री बलवन्त को संसद् के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहिता घोषित करता है ।

[सं. हर.-वि. स./2/72(3)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th February, 1973

S.O. 931.—WHEREAS the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Balwant of Village, Nogwan, P.O. and Tehsil Naraingarh, District Ambala (Haryana) who was contesting candidate for election to the Haryana Legislative Assembly from 2-Naraingarh constituency held in March, 1972, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Balwant to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this Order.

[No. HN-LA/2/72(3)]

आवेश

का. आ. 932.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए महाराष्ट्र विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 243 मान निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री भोंसले बापूराव शिवराम स्थान तथा डा. शिंगनापुर, तालुका-मान, जिला सतारा, महाराष्ट्र लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धान बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री भोंसले बापूराव शिवराम का संसद् के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहिता घोषित करता है ।

[सं. महाराष्ट्र-वि. स./243/72(6)]

ORDER

S.O. 932.—WHEREAS the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Bhosale Bapurao Shivram, At and Post Shingnapur, Taluka Man, District Satara (Maharashtra), a

contesting candidate for the general election held in March, 1972, to the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly from 243-Man constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Bhosale Bapurao Shivram to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MT-LA/243/72(6)]

आवेश

नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 933.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1971 में हुए पश्चिम बंगाल विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 176 पोलवा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री रजनी टुडु, ग्राम बरसासा, पो. आ. झटाचुना जिला हुगली, पश्चिम बंगाल, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धान बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्द्वारा उक्त श्री रजनी टुडु को संसद् के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहिता घोषित करता है ।

[सं. प.ब.-वि.स./176/71(43)]

ए. एन. सैन, सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 8th March, 1973

S.O. 933.—WHEREAS the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Rajani Tudu, Village Barasarsa, P.O. Itachuna, District Hooghly, West Bengal, a contesting candidate for election to the West Bengal Legislative Assembly from 176-Polba constituency, held in March, 1971 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate, even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Rajani Tudu to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. WB-LA/176/71(43)]

A. N. SEN, Secy.

ERRATA

New Delhi, the 15th March, 1973

S.O. 934.—The following Errata to the Election Commission's notifications Nos. 434/TN/72(1) and 434/TN/72(2), both dated the 10th October, 1972, published at S.O. 3761 on pages 5276-5277 and S.O. 3762, on pages 5278-79, respectively in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3(ii), No. 45 dated the 4th November, 1972, is issued :

(i) Notification No. 434/TN/72(1), dated the 10th October 1972 :

Page No.	Sl. No.	Col. No.	
5277	6	2	For the word 'Velloce' read "Vellore".
5277	7	2	For the word 'Velloe' read "Vellore".
5277	8	1	For the word 'Wandiwarh' read "Wandiwash".
5277	13	1	In column 1 against S. No.13, the word 'Krishnagiri' may be inserted.
5277	38	2	For the words 'District Revenue 'Tirunelveli' read "District Revenue Officer, Tirunelveli".

(ii) Notification No. 434/TN/72(2), dated the 10th October, 1972:

Page No.	Sl. No.	Col. No.	
5279	9	2	For the words and figures '2. Revenue Divisional Officer, Tiruvandamalai' and '3. Revenue Divisional Officer, Tindivanam, read "2. Revenue Divisional Officer, Tindivanam".
5279	21	2	For the word 'Gobichetti-palayam' read "Gobichetti-palayam".
5279	26	1	For the words 'Returning Officer of 25-Tiruchirapalli parliamentary constituency read "Returning Officer of 26-Tiruchirapalli parliamentary constituency".
5279	29	1	For the words 'Returning Officer of 29-Kumbakonam constituency' read "Returning Officer of 29-Kumbakonam parliamentary constituency".

[No. 434/TN/72.]

A. N. SEN, Secy.

आवेष

नई दिल्ली, 2 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 935.—यसः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मैसूर विधान सभा के लिए निर्वाचन के लिए 59 कोराटागरे निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री राजू एल. सदा स्टीट कोराटागरे, जिला तुमकूर (मैसूर), लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा संशोधन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित समय के अन्दर तथा रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं।

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है।

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री राजू एल. का संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुन जाने और होने के लिए इस आवेष की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहिता घोषित करता है।

[सं. मैसूर-वि. स./59/72]

बी. नागसुब्रमण्यन, सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd March, 1973

S.O. 935.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Raju, L., Sadar Street, Koratagere, Tumkur District (Mysore State) a contesting candidate for election to the Legislative Assembly from 59-Koratagere constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses within the time and in the manner as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10-A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Raju, L., to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly Legislative Council of a state for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MY-LA/59/72]

V. N. NAGASUBRAMANIAN, Secy.

बिधि, न्याय एवं कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय

(कम्पनी कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 मार्च 1973

का. आ. 936.—एकाधिकार एवं निर्बन्धनकारी व्यापार प्रथा अधिनियम, 1969 (1969 का 54) की धारा 26 की उप-धारा (3) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा मैसर्स दि हूगली डॉकिंग एण्ड इंजीनियरिंग कम्पनी लिमिटेड के कथित अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत पंजीकरण (पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र संख्या 822/71 दिनांक 19/11/1971) के निरस्तीकरण का अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं. 22/47/72-एम. (2)]

सु. बलरामन, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE & COMPANY AFFAIRS
(Department of Company Affairs)

New Delhi, the 14th March, 1973

S.O. 936.—In pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 26 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (54 of 1969), the Central Government hereby notifies the cancellation of THE HOOGLY DOCKING & ENGINEERING CO. LTD. under the said Act (Certificate of Registration No. 822/71 dated the 19th November, 1971).

[F. No. 22/47/72-M(II)]

S. BALARAMAN, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व और बीमा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 25 नवम्बर, 1972

आयकर

का. आ. 937.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 80 छ की उपधारा (2) (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए, श्रीराम मंदिर, बजरंगपुरी, लोधी रोड, नई दिल्ली को समस्त दिल्ली राज्य में प्रसिद्ध लोकपूजा के स्थान के रूप में एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं. 232/फा. सं. 176/47/72-आयकर (ए. आई.)]

बी. माधवन, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue & Insurance)

New Delhi, the 25th November, 1972

INCOME TAX

S.O. 937.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2)(b) of Section 80G of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies Sri Ram Mandir, Bajrangpuri Lodi Road, New Delhi to be a place of public worship of renown throughout Delhi State for the purposes of the said section.

[N. 232/F. No. 176/47/72-JT (AJ)]

B. MADHAVAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 15 फरवरी, 1973

आयकर

का. आ. 938.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि नीचे वर्णित संख्या वैज्ञानिक और औद्योगिक अनुसन्धान परिषद् विहित प्राधिकारी द्वारा, आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (2) के प्रयोजनों के लिए अनुमोदित की गयी है।

संस्था

धर्मीसिंह इंडस्ट्रियल रिसर्च फाउण्डेशन प्राइवेट लिमि. मुम्बई।

[सं. 296/फा. सं. 203/15/72-आई. टी. (ए. 2)]

टी. पी. भुनभुनवाला, उप-सचिव

New Delhi, the 15th February, 1973

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 938.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

INSTITUTION

Dharumsingh Industrial Research Foundation Pvt. Ltd., Bombay.

[No. 296/F. No. 203/15/72-JT(A. II)]

T. P. JHUNJHUNWALA, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 1973

आयकर

का. आ. 939.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 80 छ की उपधारा (2) (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री सेल्वा विनयागर मंदिर मद्रास को उक्त धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए ऐतिहासिक महत्व और तमिलनाडु राज्य में सर्वत्र विख्यात लोक पूजा के स्थान के रूप में एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं. 300/फा. सं. 176/7/73-आई टी (ए आई.)]

वी. बी. श्रीनिवासन्, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 1973

INCOME TAX

S.O. 939.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2)(b) of Section 80G of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies Shri Selva Vinayagar Temple, Madras to be of historic importance and a place of public worship of renown throughout the State of Tamilnadu for the purposes of the said section.

[No. 300/F. No. 176/7/73-IT(AI)]

V. B. SRINIVASAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 22 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 940.—जीवन बीमा निगम अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 31) के भाग 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा वित्त मंत्रालय में विशेष कार्य अधिकारी श्री सी. एस. अनन्तपद्मनाभन् का, श्री ए. राजगोपालन् के स्थान पर, भारत के जीवन बीमा निगम का सचिव नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 81(6)-बीमा-2/72]

बी. एन. बागची, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd March, 1973

S.O. 940.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956 (31 of 1956) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri C. S. Ananta-padmanabhan, officer on Special Duty, Ministry of Finance as member of the Life Insurance Corporation of India, vice Shri A. Rajagopalan.

[F. No. 81(6)-Ins.II/72]

B. N. BAGCHI, Under Secy.

(केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 31 मार्च, 1973

सीमा-शुल्क

का. आ. 941.—सीमा-शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क बोर्ड, महाराष्ट्र राज्य के खोपोली को भाण्डागारण केन्द्र के रूप में एतद्वारा घोषित करता है।

[सं. 44/73-सीमा-शुल्क/फा. सं. 473/59/72-सी. शु. 7]

कै. शंकररामन, अवर सचिव

(Central Board of Excise & Customs)

New Delhi, the 31st March, 1973

CUSTOMS

S.O. 941.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby declares Khopoli in the State of Maharashtra to be a warehousing station.

[No. 44/73-Customs/F. No. 473/59/72-Cus. VII]

K. SANKARARAMAN, Under Secy.

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA
(Central Office)
(Department of Banking)

CORRIGENDUM

Bombay, the 21st February, 1973

S.O. 942.—"In the statement of the Affairs of the R.B.I., Banking Department as on 29th December 1972 published at page 174 of Part II section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India issue dated 20th January 1973 the figures against the heads "Notes" and "Bills Purchased and Discounted (a) Internal" on the assets side of the statement should be read as 4,92,35,000/- and 85,50,000/- instead of 4,92,35,00,000/- and 5,50,000 respectively."

[No. 437/4-72/73]

C. D. DESHMUKH, P. Chief Accountant.

(बैंककारी विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 943.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबन्ध और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध) स्कीम, 1970 के खण्ड 13 के उपखण्ड (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् श्री के. एस. आर. मल्लिहाह के स्थान पर श्री एस. आर. ठाकुर को 9 मार्च, 1973 को प्रारंभ होने वाली और 10 दिसम्बर, 1973 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिए कनारा बैंक प्रबन्ध समिति के सदस्य के रूप में एतद्वारा नामनिर्देशित करती है।

[सं. 8/4/73-बी. ओ. आई]

(Department of Banking)

New Delhi, the 9th March, 1973

S.O. 943.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (2) of clause 13 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank, hereby nominates Shri S. R. Thakur to be a member of the Management Committee of Canara Bank for the period commencing on 9th March, 1973 and ending with 10th December, 1973, vice Shri K. S. R. Malliah.

[No. 8/4/73-BOI]

नई दिल्ली, 16 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 944.—बैंकिंग विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10वां) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर, एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 के उपबन्ध की हिन्दुस्तान कामर्सियल बैंक लि., कानपुर पर, उसकी धौलपुर स्थित अचल सम्पत्ति (भूमि खण्ड) के सम्बन्ध में 15 मार्च, 1974 तक लागू नहीं होंगे।

[सं. एफ. 15(5)-बी. ओ. 3/73]

New Delhi, the 16th March, 1973

S.O. 944.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of section 9 of the said Act shall not apply till the 15th March 1974 to the Hindustan Commercial Bank Ltd., Kanpur, in respect of the immovable property (plot of land) held by it at Dholpur.

[No. F. 15(5)-B.O. III/73]

का. आ. 945.—बैंकिंग विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर, एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 बी की उपधारा (1) और (2) के उपबन्ध, एी ऑरियन्टल बैंक आफ कामर्स लि., नई दिल्ली पर 30 जून, 1973 तक अथवा बैंक के पूर्णकालिक अध्यक्ष की नयी नियुक्ति होने तक, इनमें जो भी पहले हो, लागू नहीं होंगे।

[सं. 14(13)-बी. ओ. 3/72]

द. म. सुक्थनकर, निदेशक

S.O. 945.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of sub-sections (1) and (2) of section 10B of the said Act shall not apply to the Oriental Bank of Commerce Ltd., New Delhi, till the 30th June 1973 or till the next appointment of a whole-time Chairman of that bank, whichever is earlier.

[No. 14(13)-B.O. III/72]

D. M. SUKTHANKAR, Director.

नई दिल्ली, 17 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 946.—औद्योगिक विस्तार निगम अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 15वां) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री आर. वी. रामन, सचिव, भारत सरकार को औद्योगिक विकास मंत्रालय के श्री बी. बी. लाल के स्थान पर भारतीय औद्योगिक विस्तार निगम का निदेशक नियुक्त करती है।

[सं. 1-1/73/औ. वि. 2]

डी. के. सैन, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 17th March, 1973

S.O. 946.—In pursuance of clause (b) of Sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948 (15 of 1948) the Central Government hereby nominates Shri R. V. Raman, Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Industrial Development, as a Director of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India vice Shri B. B. Lal.

[No. 1-1/73/IF II]

D. K. SEN, Dy. Secy.

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 16th March, 1973

S.O. 947.—In Notification No. 14(2)-B.O. III/72 dated 3rd June, 1972 published at page 3124 of Part II, Section 3(ii)

of the Gazette of India dated the 12th August, 1972 the following correction may be made, namely :—

(Line 5) FOR 'Section 19' Read 'Section 10'

(Line 8) FOR 'Fron' Read 'From'.

[No. 14(2)-B.O. III/72]

PREM KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 16 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 948.—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 (1934 का 2) की धारा 50 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, निम्नलिखित फर्मों को, वर्ष 1972-73 के लिए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के संपरीक्षक के रूप में पुर्ननिर्णयित करती है, अर्थात्:—

1. मैसर्स ठाकुर वैद्यनाथ अय्यर एण्ड कम्पनी, थाप्पर हाउस, 124, जनपथ, नई दिल्ली ।
2. मैसर्स सुरी एण्ड कम्पनी 1/29, माउंट रोड, पी. बी. सं. 2442, मद्रास-2

[सं. का. 10(1)/73-बी. ओ. आई(1)]

New Delhi, the 16th March, 1973

S.O. 948.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 50 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, (2 of 1934), the Central Government hereby re-appoints the following firms as auditors of Reserve Bank of India for the year 1972-73, namely :—

1. M/s. Thakur Vaidyanath Aiyar & Co., Thappar House, 124, Janpath, New Delhi.
2. M/s. Suri & Co., 1/29, Mount Road, P.B.No. 2442, Madras-2.

[No. F. 10(1)/73-B.O.I(ii)]

का. आ. 949.—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 (1934 का 2) की धारा 50 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, निम्नलिखित फर्मों को, वर्ष 1972-73 के लिए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के संपरीक्षक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है, अर्थात्:—

1. मैसर्स पी. के. मित्र एण्ड कम्पनी, चार्टर्ड एकाउंटेंट्स, पी-7, मिशन रो एक्सटेंशन, कलकत्ता-1
2. मैसर्स दलाल एण्ड शाह, चार्टर्ड एकाउंटेंट्स, 49/55 अपोलो स्ट्रीट, मुम्बई-1

[सं. का. 10(1)/73-बी. ओ. आई (2)]

S.O. 949.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 50 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, (2 of 1934), the Central Government hereby appoints the following firms as auditors of the Reserve Bank of India for the year 1972-73, namely :—

1. M/s. P. K. Mitra & Co. Chartered Accountants, P-7, Mission Row Extension, Calcutta-1.
2. M/s. Dalal Shah, Chartered Accountants, 49/55, Appollo Street, Bombay-1.

[No. F. 10(1)/73-B.O.I. (ii)]

रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया

का. आ. 950.—रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में मार्च, 1973 की 9 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए देखा नई दिल्ली, 16 मार्च, 1973

धन विभाग

वेधताएं	रुपये	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट	23,81,71,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :—		
संचालन में नोट	5291,90,20,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,11,000	
जारी किये गये कुल नोट		5315,71,91,000	(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ		
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां	171,65,38,000	
			जोड़		354,18,49,000
			रुपये का सिक्का		7,18,90,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियां		4954,34,52,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे बाणिज्य पत्र		
कुल देयताएं		5315,71,91,000	कुल आस्तियां		5315,71,91,000

एस० जगन्नाथन, गवर्नर

तारीख : 14 मार्च, 1973

9 मार्च, 1973 को रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	प्राप्तियां	रुपये
चुक्ता पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	23,81,71,000
प्रारक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	3,84,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	209,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का	3,55,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि	45,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये विल	
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	175,00,00,000	(क) देशी	17,18,38,000
जमा राशियां :—		(ख) विदेशी	..
(क) सरकारी		(ग) सरकारी खजाना विल	101,55,58,000
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	59,44,98,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया@	178,75,08,000
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	8,84,44,000	निवेश**	364,10,48,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अधिम :—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	280,15,17,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	..
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	13,59,66,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को@	97,58,23,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	1,05,13,000	ऋण और अधिम :—	
(iv) अन्य बैंक	32,83,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को†	197,91,50,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को‡	292,22,54,000
		(iii) दूसरों को	4,28,62,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण,	
		अधिम और निवेश	
		(क) ऋण और अधिम :—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	54,49,89,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	23,02,87,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त निगम को	15,70,00,000
(ग) अन्य	88,88,91,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश	11,23,92,000
वेय विल	93,66,40,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अधिम	
अन्य देयताएं	425,66,81,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अधिम	28,98,67,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	
		से ऋण, अधिम और निवेश	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अधिम	93,68,29,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिबेंचरों	
		में निवेश	..
		अन्य प्राप्तियां	51,01,18,000
रुपये	1555,64,33,000	रुपये	1555,64,33,000

*नकदी, आवधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

**राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

@राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अधिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों को दिये गये अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

†रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17(4)(ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को सीमांकी बिलों पर अधिम दिये गये 24,50,00,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

‡राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अधिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

एस० जगन्नाथन, गवर्नर

तारीख : 14 मार्च, 1973

[सं० फ० 1(1)/73-बी० प्रो० आई]

ख० व० मीरचन्दानी, प्रवर सचिव

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

S. O. 950—An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India 1934, for the week ended the 9th day of March 1973

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	23,81,71,000		Gold Coin and Bullion:—		
			(a) Held in India	182,53,11,000	
Notes in circulation	5291,90,20,000		(b) Held outside India	..	
Total Notes issued		5315,71,91,000	Foreign Securities	171,65,38,000	
			Total		354,18,49,000
			Rupee Coin		7,18,90,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		4954,34,52,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper		..
Total Liabilities		5315,71,91,000	Total Assets		5315,71,91,000

S. JAGANNATHAN, Governor

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 9th March, 1973

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	Notes	23,81,71,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Rupees Coin	3,84,000
		Small Coin	3,55,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	209,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted:—	
		(a) Internal	17,18,38,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	45,00,00,000	(b) External	..
		(c) Government Treasury Bills	101,55,58,000
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	175,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad*	178,75,08,000
		Investments**	364,10,48,000
Deposits:—		Loans and Advances to:—	
(a) Government		(i) Central Government	..
(i) Central Government	59,44,98,000	(ii) State Governments@	97,58,23,000
(ii) State Governments	8,84,44,000	Loans and Advances to:—	
(b) Banks		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	197,91,50,000
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	280,15,17,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks‡	292,22,54,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	13,59,66,000	(iii) Others	4,28,62,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,05,13,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(iv) Other Banks	32,83,000	(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
(c) Others	88,88,91,000	(i) State Governments	54,49,89,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	23,02,87,000
Bills Payable	93,66,40,000	(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	..
Other Liabilities	425,66,81,000	(iv) Agricultural Refinance Corporation	15,70,00,000
Rupees	1555,64,33,000	(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	11,23,92,000
		Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to State Co-Operative Banks	28,98,67,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	93,68,29,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	..
		Other Assets	51,01,18,000
		Rupees	1555,64,33,000

*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 24, 50,00,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17 (4) (c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

‡Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 14th March, 1973

S. JAGANNATHAN, Governor

[No.F.1 (1)/73-BOI]

C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

पूति अक्षय निधि के कोषपाल का कार्यालय

शुद्धि पत्र

नई दिल्ली 21 मार्च 1973

क्र० आ० 951.—वित्त मंत्रालय के आर्थिक कार्य विभाग के भारतीय पूति अक्षय निधि के कोषपाल के कार्यालय की दिनांक 15 जून 1972 की अधिसूचना संख्या 1/1/72-टी०सी०ई०, जो 28 अक्टूबर 1972 के भारत के राजपत्र के भाग II, खण्ड 3, उप खण्ड (ii) की एस०प्रो० 3503 के अन्तर्गत पृष्ठ संख्या 5022 से 5080 पर प्रकाशित की गयी थी, का शुद्धि-पत्र।

पृष्ठ संख्या	क्रम संख्या	स्तम्भ संख्या	अशुद्ध	शुद्ध
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
5022	2	—	31 मार्च 1971	31 मार्च 1972
5024	3	1	अधिसूचना संख्या एफ० 14-28-61 इस्टिड्यूट	अधिसूचना संख्या एफ० 14-26-61 इस्टिड्यूट
5027	10	1	16	10
5029	4	9	74,686 वर्ग भूमि में गज	74,686 वर्ग गज भूमि में से
5036	4	5	15,51,900.00	15,51,000.00
5038	क्रम संख्या 8 के सामने स्तम्भ सं० 7,8,9,10 और 11 के नीचे दिये गए आंकड़ों को अगले पृष्ठ पर क्रम संख्या 9 के स्तम्भ संख्या 7,8,9,10 और 11 के आंकड़ों के रूप में पढ़ें। क्रम संख्या 7 के सामने इन्हीं स्तम्भों के नीचे दिये गये आंकड़ों को क्रम संख्या 8 के आंकड़ों के रूप में पढ़ें।			
5041	10	8	,443.00	6,443.00
5053	9	11(ii) जोड़	3 प्रतिशत व्याज वाला मद्रास ऋण 1971 7,51,000	4 प्रतिशत व्याज वाला मद्रास ऋण 1971 7,51,100
5056	18	4	4½ प्रतिशत ऋण 1973	4½ प्रतिशत ऋण 1973
5061	25	9	.08	2.08
5062	मद्रास	6	65,232.00	55,232.00
5064	3	4	4½ प्रतिशत मद्रास ऋण 1980	5½ प्रतिशत मद्रास ऋण 1980
5068	2	4	5½ प्रतिशत मध्य प्रदेश ऋण	5½ प्रतिशत मध्य प्रदेश ऋण 1983
5070	10	4	4 प्रतिशत मध्य प्रदेश ऋण 1971	..
5071	9	9	62.26	62.36

(Deptt. of Economic Affairs)

Office of the Treasurer of Charitable Endowment for India

E R R A T A

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1973

S.O. 951.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Office of the Treasurer of Charitable Endowments for India) No.F.1/1/72-TCE, dated the 15th June, 1972, published as S. O. 3503 in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3(ii), dated the 28th October, 1972, at pages 4991 to 5021 [Pages 1 to 31 in the copy]—

Page 4991—"Heading"—Insert the word 'No.' above column 2. Column 6 to 8 Read 'Property' For 'Pro-
perty'.

Case No. 1, Column 5, para (d), Lines 3 and 4 Read 'non-officials' For 'non-officers'. para(f), lines 3 and 4, Read 'Deshbandhu' For 'Desh-
bandhru'.

Column 6, line 15, Read 'line' For 'laine'.
line 17, Read 'remainder' For 'remainder'.

Case No. 2, Column 5, line 4, Read 'Hospital' For 'Hosiptal'.

Page 4992—Case No. 4, Column 6, against 1, Read 'Dispensary' For 'Dispeanary'.

against 3, Insert 'X' between the figures (30 ft. and 35 ft.).

Maharashtra—Case No. 1, Column 6, line 10, Read 'admeasure-
ment' For 'Admeasument'.

Page 4993—Case No. 3A—Column 6, line 4, Read 'land' For 'and'.

Case Nos. 6 and 7, Column 6, line 3, Read 'leasc-
hold' For 'leashold'.

Case Nos. 8 and 9, Column 6, line 2, Read 'House' For 'Honse'.

Line 7, omit the alphabet 'e' before the figure '3487.2/9'.

Case No. 10—Column 6, line 2, Read 'known as' For 'knonw st'.

Line 4, Read 'Foras', For 'Faras'.

Line 5, Read '2,290', For '2.290'.

Page 4994—Case Nos. 12 and 13, Column 6, line 4, Read '8,570' For '8.570'.

Read 'other', For 'pther' in line 7.

Line 11, Read 'messuages', For 'meassuages'.

Line 12, Read 'dwelling', For 'dwelling'.

Column 9, line 1, Read 'sq', For 'so'.

Lines 6 and 7, Read 'Acquisition', For Acquisition'.

Page 4994—Case No. 14, Column 6, line 1, Read 'Parel', For 'Patel'.

Line 4, Read 'squerc', For 'square'.

Line 5, Read '7,021 square', For '7.021 sq. r'.

Line 7, Read '2,189', For '2.189'.

Line 10, Read 'land', For 'and'.

Line 13, Read 'Parel', For 'Parrel'.

Against para Thirdly, line 4, Read '1,058' For '1.058'.

Column 9, line 7, Read 'yards', For 'yardes'.

Lines 11 and 12, Read 'Acquisition', For 'Aqasi-
tion'.

Line 18, delete the word 'of'.

Line 20, Read 'Hydro', For 'Hydrp'.

Line 30, Read '37,471.52', For '37.471.52'.

Line 44, Read 'Parel', For 'Partel'.

Line 49, Read '2,043.88' For '2.043.88'.

Line 51, Insert 'of' against the word 'yards'.

Page 4995—Column 9, lines 22 and 23, Read 'Acquisition Act I of 1894', For 'Acquisition Act'.

Case No. 15—Column 9, Read '1,99,675.08' For '1.99.675.08'.

Case No. 16—Column 6, line 4, Read 'admeasuring' For 'admesasuring'.

Case No. 17, Column 6, line 1, Read 'parcel' For 'arcel'.

Line 2, Read 'messuage', For 'message'.

Page 4996—Madras—Case No. 1, Column 2, Add the figures 'F.19-39/ 54/' between the words No. and H3 in line 12.

Column 4, line 5, Read '(Lovcdale)' For '(Love-date)'.

Column 5, line 14, Read 'shall', For 'sghall'.

Column 6, Heading below para (b), For 'S.N. 10' and 'E. tent' Read 'S.No.' and 'Extont' against the word 'Village'.

Below 'Village' Read 'Ketti', For 'Ketri' wherever it occurs.

Below 'S.No.' Read '1224/4', For '112244'.

Read '1,355/3' For "1355/5, against '25.34'.

Read '1,355/5' for '1355/3' against '4.20'.

Column 9, delete the words 'sas were for' in lines 21 and 22.

Uttar Pradesh—Case No. 1, Column 2, line 5, Read '1923' For '923'.

Column 4, lines 4 and 5, Read 'Endowment', For 'Endonement'.

Column 5, line 2, Read 'consisting' For 'Consistng'.

Insert the words 'pur as ex-officio' between the lines 3 and 4.

Column 6, para (a), line 2, Read 'Welleslygunj' For 'Welleslygung'.

Para (b), line 2, Read 'Tehsil' For 'Tehsil'.

Page 4997—Punjab Line 2, Read, 'prepared' For 'pepared'.

Pages 4998-4999—Case No. 1, Column 8, Read '2,99,370.38' For '2,99,37 0.38'.

Column 11, line 2, Read 'of' For '0'.

Line 3, Read '24,700/-' For '24.700/-'.

Line 6, Read 'Fixed' For 'Fixeed'.

Case No. 3, Column 11, line 2, Read 'redemp' For 'redom'.

Case No. 5, Column 4, Read 'Conversion' For 'Converasion'.

Case No. 6, Column 4, Read '60,000.00' For '600,00.00'.

Column 5, Read '1,67,900.00' For '167,900.00'.

Column 6, Read '49,137.00' For '49 137.00'.

Column 7, Read '7,28,200.00' For '7,28.200.00'.

Column 8, Read '7,77,337.00' For '7,77,337.000'.

Column 9, against interest remitted Read '48,645.62' For '48.645.62'.

Column 11, line 1, Read 'this' for 'his'.

Line 5, Read '1,00,000/-' For '1,00,00/-'.

Line 7, Read 'Savings' For 'Saivngs'.

Line 11, Read 'authorities' For 'athorities'.

Pages 5000-5001—Case No. 7, Column 4, line 7, Read 'ficates' For 'cates'.

Column 5, Read '2,45,100.00' For '2,45,100.000'.

Case No. 11, Column 4, Lines 5 and 6 read 'Municipal' For 'Municipipal'.

Column 9, Insert '(1)' before the words 'other payments'.

Column 11, Para (f), Insert 'Rs. 44,86,000/- at a cost of' between lines 4 and 5.

Para 1(ii) line 4, Read 'uninvested' For 'uninvested'.

Case No. 12, Column 2, lines 2 and 3, Read 'Library' For 'Libraary'.

Column 8, Read '16,625.00' For '16,625.000'.

Pages 5002-5003—Case No. 14, Column 9, Read the words and figures as below :—

Interest remitted	1,18,794.80
Fee paid to Govt.	1,199.95
(h) Other payments	1,29,07,000.00
	<hr/> 1,30,26,994.75

Column 10, omit the figures '1,29,07,000.00' and '1,30,26,994.75'.

Case No. 16, Column 4, Read '50,000.00' For '50,00.00' against 4½ % Uttar Pradesh State Development Loan 1974.

Column 6, insert '(i)' before the figure '1,33,015.50'.

Pages 5002-5003—Case No. 16, Column 9, omit 'K' before the words 'Fee paid to Govt.'

Insert '(k)' before the words 'Other payments'.

Maharashtra—Case No. 1, Column 6, Insert '(1)' before the figure '12,819.50'.

Column 11, para (n), line 3, Read '2,761.60P,' For '2,61.60P'.

Pages 5004-5005—Case No. 2, Column 2, line 3, Read 'Bangalore' For 'Banglore'.

Column 6, Insert '(0)' against '28,590.38'.

Column 9, (i) Read '(q)' For '(b)' against 'Other payments'.

(ii) Read '28,233.71' For '28,133.71' against 'Interest remitted'.

(iii) Read '28,691.47' For '28.691.407'.

Column 11, (i) Read '(0)' For '(i)' against para 1.

(ii) Read '14-7-1971' For '14-7-1972' in line 11 in para (2).

(iii) Read '5½%' For '5½%' in line 1 against '(q)'.

Case No. 3, Column 6, Insert '(r)' against '1,404.00'.

Column 7, Insert '(s)' against '396.00'.

Case No. 4, Column 7, Insert '(t)' against '17.31'.

Column 9, Read the words and figures as below:

Fee paid to Govt.	(i)	0.03
Interest remitted		1.73
Fee paid to Govt.		0.02
	(f)	<hr/> 1.75
Interest remitted		1.73
Fee paid to Govt.		0.02
	(k)	<hr/> 1.75
Total		<hr/> 3.53

Column 11, Read '1964' For '1964A' in line 3 against Para (i).

Case No. 7, Column 2, lines 3 and 4, Read 'Education' For 'Educacation'.

Case No. 8, Column 4, Insert '4%' against B.P.T. Loan.

Pages 5006-5007—Case No. 9, Column 2, line 1, Read 'Sassoon' For 'Sasson'.

Column 3, Insert 'of' between 'Board' and 'Trustees'.

Column 9, Read '(u)' For '(U)' against 'Other payments'.

Column 11 (i) Insert '1971' between 'Loan' and 'Rs. 6,30,000' against (i).

(ii) Read '45,000' For '45.000' against (ii) Case No. 10, Column 2, line 4, Read 'After-care' For 'After'.

Column 3, line 4, Read 'B.I.T.' For 'P.I.T.' and 'No.' for 'Co'.

Column 4, Insert '1946' with '3% Conversion Loan.'

Case No. 13, Column 4, Read 'Loan' For 'Toan' against '2,000.00'.

Case No. 15, Column 4, Read '4½ % Maharashtra Loan 1976' For '4½ Maharashtra Toan 1976'.

Column 6, Read '(v)' For '(V)'.

Column 11, Para (x) Read '13,300/-' For '13.300'.

Case No. 16, Column 6, Read '745.50' For '75.50'.

Column 11, Insert '(y)' before 'Represents.'

Pages 5008-5009—Case No. 18, Column 3, line 4, Delete 'Q'.

Case No. 19, Column 5, Read '1,600.00' For '1,6 0 00'.

Case No. 20, Column 4, Read '1,000.00' For '1,000.00'.

Case No. 21, Column 6, Read '(ad) 16,359.00' For 'ad 16,652.00'.

Column 11, line 6, Read 'Exemption' For 'exemption'.

Line 7, Delete 'it'.

Case No. 22, Column 3, line 1, Read 'Agricultural' For 'Ogricultural'.

Column 4, Insert '3%' against 'Conversion Loan.'

Column 6, Read '384.00' For '314.00'.

Case No. 23, Column 2, Read 'Memorial' For 'Memoria'.

Case No. 25, Column 3, Read, 'Committee of Management of the Asiatic Society of Bombay, Town Hall, Bombay-I' For 'Committee of Management of the Bombay Branch of the Asiatic Society, Own Hall, Bombay-I'.

Pages 5010-5011—Case No. 26, Column 2, line 1, Read 'Jamsetjee' For 'Jamestjee'.

Column 4, Read '3% Conv. Loan 1946' For '3% Xonv. Loan 1946' against 12,99,500.00

Read '4½ % Maharashtra Loan 1972'

For '4% Maharashtra Loan 1972' against 19,500.00.

Read '4½ % Loan 1989 For '4½ % Loan 1989 against 500.00

Read '5½ % Maharashtra Loan 1977' For '5½ % Maharashtra Loan 1977' against 500.00

Read 'Electricity' For 'Elecrricity' in the penultimate line.

Column 5, Read '26,25,900.00' For '6,25,900.00'.

Column 6, Read '1,13,833.75' For '1,13,833.7'.

Column 7, Delete '(ah) 1,13,833.75'

Column 11, Read '3,411.32' For '3,411.' against item No. (iii).

Pages 5012-5013—Case No. 27, Column 4, line 2, Read 'Mahr.' For 'Majhr.'

Madras

Case No. 1, Column 4, Read '16,400.00' For '16,000.00', against 4½ % Loan 1986 and '16,000.00' For '6,000.00' against 5½ % Loan 1990.

Case No. 3, Column 2, line 1, Read 'Jonnagadla' For 'Jonnagalla', Column 4, line 5, Read 'Madras' For 'Madars'.

Pages 5014-5015—West Bengal

Case No. 1, Column 8, Read '98,352.00' For '8,352.00'.

Case No. 2, Column 2, line 2, Read 'Endowment' For 'Endowment'.

Case No. 3, Column 3, line 2, Read 'Hospital' For 'Hosp8tal'.

Column 7, Read '1,389.25' For '1,380.25'

Column 8, Read '1,389.25' For 'a, 389.25'.

Madhya Pradesh

Case No. 1, Column 3, para (3), line 3, Read 'of' For 'for'.

Case No. 3, Column 3, Insert 'and' after 'Agriculture.'

Pages 5016-5017—Case No. 5, Column 2, line 1, Read 'Krishna-bai' For 'Krihnabai'.

Case No. 7, Column 3, line 1, Read 'Secretary' For 'Secretqry'.

Case No. 14, Columns 7 and 11, Read '(at)' For '(as)'.

Column 11, line 2, Read 'reinvestment' For 'cinvestment'.

Pages 5020-5021—Case No. 10 Column 9, Read '172.26' For '172.62'.

Case No. 15, Column 7, Insert '(ff)' against the figure '2.00'.

Case No. 16, Column 2, lines 4 and 5, Read, 'Endowment' For 'Eudowment', Column 4, Read '1,06,600.00' For '1,06,000.00'.

Punjab

Line 1, Read 'apportionment' For 'appoint-ment'.

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 5 अगस्त, 1972

आयकर

क्रा० प्रा० 952.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 126 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 1 (फा० सं० 55/233/63-आई० टी०) तारीख 18-5-1964 से उपाबद्ध समय-समय पर यथा संशोधित अनुसूची में एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित जोड़ता है।

उक्त अनुसूची में क्रम सं० 65 के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित मव जोड़ी जाएगी:—

1	2	3	4	5	6
66.	इंडियन एक्सप्लोसिव्स लिमिटेड जो भारत में कहीं भी स्थित हो, के प्रबंध-कर्मचारिवृन्द।	आयकर अधिकारी ए-वार्ड, जिला III (क), कलकत्ता	आयकर सहायक आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) जिसे जिला III (क) कलकत्ता की बाबत आयकर सहायक आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) के कृत्यों का पालन करने के लिए नियुक्त किया गया है।	आयकर सहायक आयुक्त (अपील) जिसमें स्तंभ (3) में निर्दिष्ट आयकर अधिकारी के विनिश्चय के विरुद्ध अपील सुनने की शक्तियां निहित की गई हैं।	आयकर आयुक्त पश्चिम बंगाल-1, कलकत्ता

यह अधिसूचना 16 अगस्त, 1972 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 4/फा० सं० 187/18/71-आई० टी० (ए० आई०)]

बी० माधवन, अव्वर सचिव

(Central Board of Direct Taxes)

New Delhi, the 5th August, 1972

INCOME-TAX

S. O. 952.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 126 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following addition to the Schedule annexed to its Notification No.1 (F.No.55/233/63-JT) dated 18-5-1964, as amended from time to time.

After the Serial No.65 in the said Schedule, the following item shall be added:—

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
66.	Management staff of Indian Explosives Ltd. stationed any where in India.	Income-tax Officer B-Ward, Dist. III (A) Calcutta.	Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, who has been appointed to perform the functions of an Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax in respect of Dist. III (A) Calcutta.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax who has been vested with the powers to hear the appeals against the decision of the Income-tax Officer, referred to in Column (3)	Commissioner of Income-tax West Bengal-I, Calcutta.

This Notification shall take effect from the 16th August, 1972.

[NO.4/F.No.187/18/71-JT(AI)]

B. MADHAVAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 1973

आयकर

क्रा० प्रा० 953.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 126 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, समय-समय पर यथासंशोधित अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 1 (फा० सं० 55/233/63-आई० टी०), तारीख 18 मई, 1964 से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित परिवर्तन करता है।

उक्त अनुसूची में क्रम सं० 67 के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित जोड़ा जाएगा:—

1	2	3	4	5
कराधेय राज्यक्षेत्र में कहीं भी आस्थित मैसर्स एस० आर० वाटलीबोर्ड एण्ड कंपनी के सभी कर्मचारी।	आयकर अधिकारी, ए-वार्ड, जिला 3(क) कलकत्ता	सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) जिसे जिला 3 (क) कलकत्ता की बाबत सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (निरीक्षण) के कृत्यों का पालन करने के लिये नियुक्त किया गया हो।	सहायक आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) जिसे स्तंभ 3 में निर्दिष्ट आयकर अधिकारी के विनिश्चय के विरुद्ध अपील सुनने की शक्ति विनिहित की गई हो।	आयकर आयुक्त, पश्चिमी बंगाल-1, कलकत्ता।

यह अधिसूचना 2 अप्रैल, 1973 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 1/फा० सं० 187/12/72-आई० टी० (ए० आई०)]

बी० बी० श्रीनिवासन, अव्वर सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd February, 1973

INCOME TAX

S. O. 953.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 126 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following addition to the Schedule annexed to its Notification No. 1 (F. No. 55/233/63-IT) dated the 18th May, 1964 as amended from time to time.

In the said Schedule after Serial No. 67, the following shall be added:—

1	2	3	4	5	6
68.	All employees of M/s. S. R. Batliboi & Co., stationed anywhere in the taxable territory.	Income-tax Officer, A-Ward, Dist. III(A), Calcutta.	Inspecting Asstt. Commissioner of Income-tax who has been appointed to perform the functions of an Inspecting Asstt. Commissioner of Income-tax in respect of Dist. III(A), Calcutta.	Appellate Asstt. Commissioner of Income-tax who has been invested with the powers to hear appeals against the decision of the Income-tax Officer referred to in Col. 3	Commissioner of Income-tax West Bengal-I Calcutta.

This notification shall take effect from the 2nd April, 1973.

[No. 1/(F. No. 187/12/72-ITAD)]
V. B. SRINIVASAN, Under Secy.

(केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समाहर्तालय)

हैदराबाद, 5 फरवरी, 1973

केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क

क्रा. आ. 954.—मैं, एस. के. श्रीवास्तव, समाहर्ता केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, हैदराबाद, एतद्वारा, इस समाहर्ता कार्यालय की दिनांक 13-12-72 को जारी की गई दिनांक 13-12-72 की अधिसूचना संख्या 1/72 को रद्द करता हूँ।

[सं. 1/73]

एस. के. श्रीवास्तव, समाहर्ता

OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OR CENTRAL EXCISE
Hyderabad, the, 5th February, 1973

CENTRAL EXCISES

S.O. 954.—I, S. K. Srivastava, Collector of Central Excise Hyderabad hereby rescind the Notification No. 1/72 dated 13-12-72 issued by this Collectorate on 13-12-72.

[No. 1/73]

S. K. SRIVASTAVA, Collector.

बम्बई, 20 फरवरी, 1973

केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क

क्रा. आ. 955[सं. सी. ई. आर./233/1/1973.]—केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियम 1944 के नियम 233 द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा इस समाहर्तालय अधिसूचना केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क सं. सी.ई./आर./233/1/1970 दिनांक 8 फरवरी, 1970 को रद्द करते हुए मैं एतद्वारा इस समाहर्तालय में उत्पाद शुल्क योग्य माल के उन सभी उत्पाद शुल्क वाताओं को, जिन पर भारत सरकार की अधिसूचना सं. 171/69 सी.ई. दिनांक 21 जून 1969 एवं अधिसूचना सं. 121/70/सी.ई. दिनांक 28 मई 1970 सं. 179/71/सी.ई. दिनांक 23 सितंबर 1971 सं. 195/71 सी.ई. दिनांक 12 नवम्बर 1971 तथा सं. 117/72/सी.ई. दिनांक 25 मार्च 1972 के साथ पीठित तथा अधिसूचना सं. 200/72 सी.ई. दिनांक 21 सितंबर 1972 द्वारा संशोधित अधिसूचना सं. 171/69 दिनांक 21 जून, 1969 द्वारा अधिसूचित केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियम 1944 के अध्याय स्तम्भ-ए में वर्णित स्वनिर्धारण पर निकासी की कार्यावधि लागू की गई है, निर्देश देता हूँ कि वे बजट दिन से एक दिन पूर्व सांय 6 बजे के तुरंत पश्चात निम्न सूचना का उल्लेख करते हुए संलग्न प्रपत्र में समुचित अधिकारी को प्रीनीलीप

के साथ क्षेत्र के केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क प्रभारी अधिक्षक को घोषणा की जानकारी दें:—

(अ) बजटीय दिन से एक दिन पूर्व सांय 6 बजे तक उनके द्वारा जारी किये गये अन्तिम गेट पास (जी. पी. 1/जी. पी. 2) की क्रमांक संख्या

(ब) उस दिन सांय 6 बजे उनके पास शेष बचा माल।

अधिक्षक को सम्बोधित इस प्रकार की घोषणा एक प्रीनीलीप सहित मुद्रांकित आवरण में बजटीय दिन पर निकासी वैन हेतु, विशेष रूप से नियुक्त किसी एक फँक्टरी अथवा फँक्टरी समूह के प्रभारी केंद्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधिकारी को सौंप दी जाये।

परीशद

एस. आर. पी. के अन्तर्गत काम करनेवाले निर्माता द्वारा बजट दिन से एक दिन पूर्व शेष माल आदि की घोषणा

1. लाइसेंसधारी का नाम:

2. एल-4, लाइसेंस संख्या:

3. विक्रय वस्तु:

मैं/हम एतद्वारा घोषित करता हूँ/करते हैं कि प्रपत्र जी पी 1/जीपी 2/ में मेरे/हमारे द्वारा जारी अन्तिम गेट पास की क्रमांक संख्या तथा मेरे/हमारे द्वारा निर्मित उत्पाद शुल्क-योग्य माल की शेष मात्रा (दिनांक)* के सांय 6 बजे निम्न प्रकार से थी:—

टैरिफ आइटम संख्या सहित माल का नाम

अन्तिम जी. पी. 1 आर. जी. 1 के /जी. पी. 2 की अनुसार उत्पाद शुल्क क्रमांक संख्या योग्य शेष माल का भंडार

[एफ. संख्या बी-6(8)/2/73]

वैकनिम्न लगल, समाहर्ता

Bombay, the 20th February, 1973

S.O. 955 [No. CER/233/1/1973].—In exercise of the powers conferred on me by Rule 233 of the central Excise Rules, 1944, and in supersession of this Collectorate Notification Central Excises No. CER/233/1/1970 dated the 8th February, 1970, I hereby direct all the assesses of excisable goods in this Collectorate to whom self removal procedure has been extended, as laid down in Chapter VII-A of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, notified under Government of India's Notification No. 171/69 CE dated the 21st June, 1969 as amended by Notification No. 200/72 CE dated 2st September, 1972 read with Notification No. 121/70-CE dated 28th May, 1970, No. 179/71-CE dated 23rd September, 1971, No. 195/71 CE dated 12th November, 1971 and No. 117/72 CE dated 25th March, 1972, that they shall intimate, immediately after 6.00 P.M. on the day prior to the Budget Day, to the Supdt. of Central Excise incharge of the Range, with a copy to the proper officer, a declaration, in the appended form furnishing the following information:

- (a) the number of last gate pass (G.P. 1. & G.P. 2) issued by them up to 6.00 P.M. on the day prior to the Budget Day.
- (b) the closing balance of stocks held by them at 6.00 P.M. on that day.

Such a declaration addressed to the Superintendent in a sealed cover, alongwith a copy thereof shall be handed over to the Central Excise Officer, specially posted in charge of the factory or in charge of a group of factories for giving clearances on the Budget day.

ANNEXURE

Declaration of stock etc. on Pre-Budget day by a manufacturer working under S.R.P.

1. Name of Licensee.
2. L-4 Licence No.
3. Commodity.

I/We hereby declare that the Serial Number of last gate-pass(es) in form G.P. 1/G.P. 2 issued by me/us and the balance in hand of the excisable goods manufactured by me/us on* (date).....at 6 P. M. was/were as under:—

Name of goods with tariff item No.	Serial No. of last G.P. 1/ G.P. 2	Closing balance of excisable goods in stock as per R.G.1

Certified that the particulars given above are correct.
Place.....

Date.....

Signature of the assessee or his authorised agent

*One day prior to the presentation of annual/supplementary budget of the Union Government.

Handed over to Supdt./A.C. of C. Ex., on..... at.....

[No. V-6(8)/2/73]

D. N. LAL, Collector

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

(आन्तरिक व्यापार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 956.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, वायदा बाजार आयोग से परामर्श करके, इस्ट इंडियन जूट एण्ड हेशन एक्सचेंज लिमिटेड, 43, नेसाजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता द्वारा अधिम सीधदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के अधीन किये गये, मान्यता के नवीकरण के लिए आवेदन पर विचार कर लेने पर और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार के हित में और लोक हित में भी होगा, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रवृत्त

शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त एक्सचेंज को कलकत्ता नगर में जूट माल (किसी भी प्रकार की किसी मिल या किसी अन्य विनिर्माता द्वारा जूट से, बनाए गए हेशन और बोरियां बनाने के कपड़े या बोरे या दोनों, टाइन या सूत या दोनों) में अधिम सीधदाओं की बाबत 28 मार्च, 1974 को समाप्त होने वाली एक वर्ष की और कालावधि के लिए एतद्वारा मान्यता प्रदान करती है।

स्पष्टीकरण :—इस अधिसूचना में, “कलकत्ता नगर” पद से अभिप्रेत है—

- (1) कलकत्ता नगर पालिका अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का पश्चिम बंगाल अधिनियम सं. 33) की धारा 5 के खण्ड (2) में यथा परिभाषित कलकत्ता तथा उसके साथ इस्टिंग्स नाथ या क्लाइड का साउथ सिरा और नदी तट तक स्ट्रैंड रोड और वे क्षेत्र जो एतद्वारा अब समाप्त टालीगंज नगरपालिका के अंतर्गत थे ;
- (2) कलकत्ता पत्तन, और
- (3) 24 परगना, नादिया, हावड़ा और हुगली जिले।

2. एतद्वारा प्रदत्त मान्यता इस शर्त के अधधीन है कि उक्त एक्सचेंज ऐसे निदेशों का अनुपालन करेगा जो वायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय-समय पर दिये जाएं।

[का. सं. 12(2)-आई.टी/73]

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Department of Internal Trade)

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1973

S.O. 956.—The Central Government, having considered in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, the application for renewal of recognition made under section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952, (74 of 1952), by the East India Jute and Hessian Exchang Limited, 43, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Exchange for a further period of one year ending with the 28th March, 1974 in respect of forward contracts in jute goods (hessian and sacking cloth or bag or both, twines or yarns or both manufactured by any of the mills or any other manufacturers of whatever nature made from jute) in the city of Calcutta.

Explanation.—In this notification, the expression “City of Calcutta” means:—

- (1) Calcutta as defined in Clause (ii) of Section 5 of the Calcutta Municipal Act, 1951, (West Bengal Act, 33 of 1951), together with part of Hastings North or South edge of Clyde Row and Strand Road to the river bank and the areas which were previously under the now defunct Tollygunge Municipality.
- (2) The port of Calcutta; and
- (3) The Districts of 24 Paraganas, Nadia, Howrah and Hooghly.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Exchange shall comply with such directions as may from time to time be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[F. No. 12(2)-IT/73]

का. आ. 957.—केंद्रीय सरकार, वायदा बाजार आयोग से परामर्श करके, ईस्ट इंडियन जूट एंड हेशन एक्सचेंज लिमिटेड, 43, नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता द्वारा अग्रिम संविदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के अधीन किये गये मान्यता के नवीकरण के लिए आवेदन पर विचार कर लेने पर और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार के हित में और लोक हित में भी होगा, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त एक्सचेंज को, पश्चिम बंगाल, बिहार, असम और उड़ीसा राज्यों और त्रिपुरा संघ, राज्य क्षेत्र में नए जूट (जिसमें मेस्टा सम्मिलित हैं) में अग्रिम संविदाओं की बाबत 28 मार्च, 1974 को समाप्त होने वाली एक वर्ष की और कालावधि के लिए एतद्वारा मान्यता प्रदान करती हैं।

2. एतद्वारा प्रदत्त मान्यता इस शर्त के अधीन है कि उक्त एक्सचेंज ऐसे निदेशों का अनुपालन करेगा जो वायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय-समय पर दिए जाएं।

[संख्या 12(2)-आई.टी./73]

आई. ए. राव, अवर सचिव

S.O. 957.—The Central Government, having considered in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, the application for renewal of recognition made under Section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952, (74 of 1952), by the East India Jute and Hessian Exchange Limited, 43, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Exchange for a further period of one year ending with the 28th March, 1974, in respect of forward contracts in raw jute (including mesta) in the States of West Bengal, Bihar, Assam and Orissa and the Union Territory of Tripura.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Exchange shall comply with such directions as may from time to time be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[F. No. 12(2)-IT/73]

Y. A. RAO, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 958.—केंद्रीय सरकार, अग्रिम संविदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के अधीन दी गयी मान्यता के नवीकरण के लिए मुम्बई आयलसीड्स एंड आयल्स एक्सचेंज, लिमिटेड, मुम्बई द्वारा आवेदन पर, वायदा बाजार आयोग से परामर्श करके विचार कर लेने पर और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार और लोकहित में भी होगा, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मूंगफली के तेल की अग्रिम संविदाओं की बाबत उक्त एक्सचेंज को 24 अप्रैल, 1974 को समाप्त होने वाली एक वर्ष की और कालावधि के लिए एतद्वारा मान्यता प्रदान करती हैं।

2. एतद्वारा दी गई मान्यता इस शर्त के अधीन है कि उक्त एक्सचेंज ऐसे निदेशों का पालन करेगा जो वायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय-समय पर दिये जायेंगे।

[का. सं. 12(3)आई.टी./73]

आई. वी. चुनकत, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd March, 1973

S.O. 958.—The Central Government, having considered, in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, the application for renewal of recognition under Section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952), by the Bombay Oilseeds and Oils Exchange Limited, Bombay, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Exchange for a further period of one year ending the 24th April, 1974, in respect of forward contracts in groundnut oil.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Exchange shall comply with such directions as may from time to time be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[F. No. 12(3)-IT/73]

I. V. CHUNKATH, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 959.—आवश्यक वस्तु अधिनियम, 1955 (1955 का 10) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार सूती वस्त्र (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1948 में और संशोधन करने के लिए एतद्वारा निम्नीलिखित आदेश करती हैं, अर्थात्:—

1. इस आदेश का नाम सूती वस्त्र (नियंत्रण) संशोधन आदेश, 1973 है।

2. सूती वस्त्र (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1948 के खण्ड 21 के उपखण्ड (1) में,—

(क) मद (5) में, अंत में "या" शब्द जोड़ा जाएगा ;

(ख) मद (5) के पश्चात् निम्नीलिखित मद अंतःस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात्:—

(6) "गांठ का सोलहवां भाग जिसमें 88 मीटर से अन्धूरा या 100 मीटर से अनधिक कपड़ा हो";

(ग) प्रथम परन्तुक में, "चौथाई और आठवां भाग" शब्दों के स्थान पर "चौथाई, आठवां, और सोलहवां भाग" शब्द रखे जाएंगे ,

(घ) द्वितीय परन्तुक में, मद (घ) में, "चौथाई या आठवां भाग" शब्दों के स्थान पर "चौथाई, आठवां या सोलहवां भाग" शब्द रखे जाएंगे ,

(ङ) स्पष्टीकरण के स्थान पर निम्नीलिखित स्पष्टीकरण रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

"स्पष्टीकरण:—इस उपखण्ड के प्रयोजन के लिए, लकड़ी की वह पेंटी, जिसमें मद (1), (2), (3), (3क), (4), (5), या (6) में यथा विनिर्दिष्ट कपड़े की मात्रा हो, यथास्थिति गांठ का पूर्ण, तीन चौथाई, अर्ध, एक तिहाई, चौथाई, आठवां या सोलहवां भाग समझी जाएगी।"

[सं. 24015(7)/72-टेक्स(ए)]

तेजेन्द्र खन्ना, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd March, 1973

S.O. 959.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 (10 of 1955), the Central Government hereby makes the following Order further to amend the Cotton Textiles (Control) Order, 1948, namely:—

1. This Order may be called the Cotton Textiles (Control) Amendment Order, 1973.

2. In Clause 21 of the Cotton Textiles (Control) Order, 1948, in sub-clause (1),—

(a) in item (v) the word “or” shall be added at the end;

(b) after item (v), the following item shall be inserted, namely:—

“(vi) one-sixteenth bales containing not less than 88 metres or not more than 100 metres of cloth”;

(c) in the first proviso, for the words “quarter and one-eighth bales” the words “quarter, one-eighth and one-sixteenth bales” shall be substituted.

(d) in the second proviso, in item (d) for the words “quarter or one eighth bales”, the words “quarter one-eighth or one-sixteenth bales” shall be substituted.

(e) for the Explanation, the following Explanation shall be substituted, namely:—

“Explanation:—For the purpose of this sub-clause, a wooden case containing the quantity of cloth as specified in items (i), (ii), (iii), (iii-a), (iv), (v), or (vi) shall also be deemed to be a full, three quarter, half, one-third, quarter, one-eighth or one-sixteenth bale, as the case may be.”

[No. 24015(7)/72-Tex(A)]

T. KHANNA, Dy. Secy.

(संयुक्त मुख्य निबंधक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 6 जनवरी, 1973

का. आ 980.—सर्वश्री चोपड़ा प्लास्टिक, सालवान स्कूल मार्केट, राजिन्द्र नगर, नई दिल्ली को सामान्य मुद्रा श्रेष्ठ से प्लास्टिक मोल्डिंग पाउडर के आयात के लिए 31,532 रु. मूल्य का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी/एस/1732330/सी/एक्स एक्स/42/डी/सी/33-34 दिनांक 28-3-72 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति की अनुमति जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति बिल्कुल उपयोग किए बिना खां गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

उपरोक्त कथन के समर्थन में आवेदकों ने आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा क्रियाविधि ईडब्ल्यू, 1972-73 के पैरा 318 में यथा अपेक्षित एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति खां गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 के खंड 9 (सी सी) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं लाइसेंस सं. पी/एस/1732330/सी/एक्स एक्स/42/डी/33-34 दिनांक

28-3-72 की मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति को रद्द करने का आदेश देता हूँ।

अब आवेदक को आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा क्रियाविधि ईडब्ल्यू, 1972-73 के पैरा 318(4) की शर्त के अनुसार लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क प्रति की अनुमति जारी की जा रही है।

[सं. एन पी/सी-19/ए एम-72/ए यू-टी/सी एन ए/4837]

के. आर. धीर, उप मुख्य निबंधक

कृत संयुक्त मुख्य निबंधक

(Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 6th January, 1973

S.O. 960.—M/s. Chopra Plastics, Salwan School Market, Rajinder Nagar, New Delhi were granted an import licence No. P/S/1732330/C/XX/42/D/33.34 dated 28-3-72 for Rs. 31,532 for import of Plastic Moulding Powder etc., from C.C.A. They have applied for issue of duplicate Custom Purposes Copy of the said licence on the ground that the original Custom Purposes Copy thereof has been lost/misplaced without having been utilised at all.

The applicant have filed an affidavit in support of the above statement, as required under para 318 of I.T.C. Hand Book of Rules and Procedure, 1972-73. I am satisfied that the original Custom Purposes Copy of the said licence has been lost/misplaced.

In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Section 9(cc) of Import Control Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955, I order the cancellation of the original Custom Purposes Copy of Licence No. P/S/1732330/C/XX/42/D/33.34 dated 28-3-72.

The applicant is now being issued duplicate Custom Purposes Copy of the licence in accordance with the provision of para 318(4) of the I.T.C. Hand Book of Rules and Procedure 1972-73.

[No. NP/C-19/AM. 72/AU. UT/CLA/4837]

K. R. DHEER, Dy. Chief Controller
for Jt. Chief Controller

(मुख्य निबंधक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 24 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 961.—श्री करतार सिंह पुत्र श्री राम सिंह के एक 1964 कमरसिडज बॉज 220 कार का आयात करने के लिए 15000 रु. के लिए सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट सं. पी/जे/3039580/एन/एम पी/42/33-34 दिनांक 17-3-72 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट की अनुमति के लिए आवेदन किया है क्योंकि मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट खो गया है। आगे यह उल्लेख किया गया है कि मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट किसी सीमाशुल्क कार्यालय में पंजीकृत नहीं कराया गया था और उसका उपयोग नहीं किया गया था।

इस तर्क के समर्थन में श्री करतार सिंह ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। उन्होंने वचन दिया है कि बाव में सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट के मिल जाने पर उसे कार्यालय के रिकार्ड के लिए लौटा देंगे। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट सं. पी/जे/3039580/एन/एम पी/42/33-34 दिनांक 17-3-72 खो गया है और निदेश देता हूँ कि उनका अनुमति सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट जारी किया जाना चाहिए। मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट को रद्द किया गया समझा जाए।

[सं. 2(आर-217)/71-72/बी. एन. एन./6330]

एम. जी. गोम्बर, उप मुख्य निबंधक

कृत मुख्य निबंधक

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th March, 1973

S.O. 961.—Mr. Kartar Singh S/o Shri Ram Singh was granted custom Clearance Permit No. P/J/3039580/N/MP/42/33-34 dated 17-3-72 for Rs. 15,000 for import of a 1964 Mercedes Benz. 220 car, has applied for a duplicate copy of the custom clearance permit as the original Customs Clearance Permit has been lost. It is further stated that the original Custom Clearance Permit was not registered with any Custom House and not utilised.

In support of this contention Mr. Kartar Singh has filed an affidavit. He has undertaken to return the Custom Clearance Permit if traced later to this office for record. I am satisfied that the original custom clearance Permit No. P/J/3039580/N/MP/42/33-34 dated 17-3-72 has been lost and direct that a duplicate Custom Clearance Permit should be issued to him. The original Custom Clearance Permit may be treated as cancelled.

[F. No. 2(R-217)/71-72/BLS/5330]

M. G. GOMBAR, Dy. Chief Controller.
for Chief Controller.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 6 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 962.—यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955, दिनांक 7-12-1955 को धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर अधोहस्ताक्षरी एतद्द्वारा सर्वश्री भारत का उर्वरक निगम लि., योजना तथा विकास प्रभाग, सी. आई. एफ. टी. बिल्डिंग, हाकखाना सिन्दरी, जिला धनबाद (बिहार) को 46,800 रु. (छ्यालीस हजार आठ सौ. रुपए मात्र) के लिए जारी किए गए आयात

लाइसेंस संख्या. जी/सी.जी/2028476/सी/एक्स. एक्स/39/एच/32, दिनांक 26-6-1971 की मूद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रतीति को रद्द करता है। लाइसेंस की मूद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रतीति का 42,699.00 रुपये के लिए उपयोग किया गया था।

लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा रद्द करने का यह कारण बताया गया है कि लाइसेंस की मूद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रतीति चोरी हो गई है और अब उन्होंने उसके बदले में उसकी अनुलिपि प्रतीति जारी करने के लिए आवेदन किया है।

[सं. सी. जी.-2/पी.एस.एम.एम.(36)/70-71]

एन. सी. कांजीलाल, उप-मुख्य निदेशक
रुत मुख् निदेशक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 6th March, 1973

S.O. 962.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended, the undersigned hereby cancels the Exchange Control Copy of the Licence No. G/CG/2028476/C/XX/39/H/32 dated 26-6-1971, for Rs. 46,800/- (Forty Six Thousand and Eight Hundred only) issued to Messrs Fertilizer Corporation of India Ltd., Planning and Development Division, C.I.F.T. Buildings, P.O. Sindri, District Dhanbad (Bihar). The original Exchange Control Copy of the licence was utilised for Rs. 42,699/-.

2. The reason for the cancellation is that the Licensee have reported that they have been robbed of the Exchange Control Copy of the licence and have now requested for the issue of a duplicate licence in lieu thereof.

[No. CG II/PCMM(36)/70-71]

N. C. KANJI LAL, Dy. Chief Controller.
for Chief Controller

औद्योगिक विकास तथा विज्ञान और औद्योगिकी मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 1973

भारतीय मानक संस्था

का. आ. 963.—भारत के राजपत्र भाग II खण्ड 3 उपखण्ड 2 दिनांक 27 मई, 1972 में प्रकाशित औद्योगिक विकास मंत्रालय (भारतीय मानक संस्था) अधिसूचना संख्या एस.ओ. 1272 दिनांक 30 मार्च, 1972 के आंशिक संशोधन के निमित्त भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि फाउंटन पेनों के मानक जिन्हें की एक अतिरिक्त डिजाइन निर्धारित की गई है जिसका शाब्दिक विवरण भारतीय मानक के शीर्षक सहित नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है।

भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) अधिनियम, 1952 और उसके अधीन बने नियमों के लिए मानक चिह्न की यह डिजाइन 6 जनवरी, 1973 से लागू हो जाएगी :—

अनुसूची

क्रम	मानक चिह्न की डिजाइन संख्या	उत्पाद और उत्पाद का वर्ग	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक की पदसंख्या और शीर्षक	भारतीय मानक चिह्न की डिजाइन का शीर्षक का विवरण
------	-----------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------

1. IS : 3706

फाउंटन पेन

IS : 3706-1966 फाउंटन पेन की विशिष्ट



भारतीय मानक संस्था का मोनोग्राम जिसमें 'ISI' शब्द होते हैं स्तम्भ (2) में दी गई शैली और अनुपात में तैयार किया गया है और जैसा दिखाया गया है उस मोनोग्राम में ऊपर की ओर भारतीय मानक की पदसंख्या दी गई है।

[सं. सी.एम.डी. 13 : 9]

ए. बी. राव, निदेशक (संकेत मार्क्स)

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY


New Delhi, the 12 March, 1973

INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTIONS

S. O. 963.—In partial modification of the Ministry of Industrial Development (Indian Standards Institution) notification No. S.O. 1272 dated 30th March, 1972 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section, 3, Sub-section (ii), dated 27th May, 1972, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies, that an additional design of the Standard Mark for fountain pens, which together with the verbal description and the title of the Indian Standard is given in the following Schedule, has been specified.

This design of the Standard Mark, for the purposes of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from 6th January, 1973 :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Product	No. and title of the Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the Design of the Standard Marks
1. IS : 3706		Fountain pen	IS:3706-1966 Specification for fountain pens	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters 'ISI', drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in Col. (2) the number designation of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

[No. CMD/13 : 9]

A. B. RAO, Director (Central Marks)

भारी उद्योग मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 24 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 964 [आई. डी. आर. ए.].—उद्योग (विकास तथा विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 65) की धारा 6 के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एम. विकास परिषद् (कार्य-विधि) नियम, 1952 के नियम 2, 4 और 5 के साथ पड़ते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को विद्युत ऊर्जा (घरेलू काम में आने वाले मीटरों तथा पैनल यंत्रों को छोड़कर) का जनित्रण, पारेषण और वितरण करने के लिए बिजली की मीटरों और मशीनों तथा उपकरणों के निर्माण अथवा उत्पादनरत अनुसूचित उद्योगों की विकास परिषद् का, जिसे भारत सरकार के औद्योगिक विकास मंत्रालय के आदेश सं. का. आ./आई.डी.आर.ए./6/5 दिनांक 25 नवम्बर, 1972 के द्वारा पुनर्गठित और स्थापित किया गया था, सघन नियुक्त करती है :—

1. श्री एस. एस. काकाडे, महाप्रबन्धक, एन. जी. ई. एफ. लि., बंगलौर ।
2. बि. बी. जे. शाहनी, प्रबन्धक निदेशक, मॅ. इन्स्ट्रुमेंटेशन लि., कोटा ।
3. श्री के. ईश्वरन, प्रबन्ध निदेशक, मॅ. हॅकब्रिज हॅवितिक एण्ड ईसन लि., मद्रास ।
4. श्री ए. एस. लक्ष्मण, अध्यक्ष, मॅ. सेनापथी ह्वाइटली लि., बंगलौर ।

2. केन्द्रीय सरकार यह भी निर्देश देती है कि उक्त आदेश में निम्नलिखित संशोधन किया जाएगा :—

- (1) श्री पी. वी. मथाई (सी.ई.डी.वी.) से संबंधित प्रविष्टि सं. 24 के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियां निविष्ट की जाएंगी, अर्थात् :—

25. श्री एस. एस. काकाडे, महाप्रबन्धक, मॅ. एन.जी.ई.एफ. बंगलौर ।

26. बि. बी. जे. शाहनी, प्रबन्ध निदेशक, मॅ. इन्स्ट्रुमेंटेशन लि., कोटा ।

27. श्री के. ईश्वरन, प्रबन्ध निदेशक, मॅ. हॅकब्रिज हॅवितिक एण्ड ईसन लि., मद्रास ।

28. श्री ए. एस. लक्ष्मण, अध्यक्ष, मॅ. सेनापथी ह्वाइटली लि., बंगलौर ।

[सं. ई. ई. आई.-19(18)/72]

आर. कृष्णस्वामी, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th March, 1973

S.O. 964 [IDRA].—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951), read with Rules 2, 4, & 5 of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints the following persons to be members of the Development Councils for the Scheduled Industries engaged in the manufacture of production of electric motors and of machinery and equipment for the generation transmission and distribution of energy (excluding house service meters and panel instruments) which was reconstituted and established by Order No. S. O./IDRA/6/5 dated the 25th November, 1972 of the Government of India, Ministry of Industrial Development:—

1. Shri S. S. Kakade, General Manager, M/s. N.G.E.F., Bangalore.
2. Brig. B. J. Shahaney, Managing Director, M/s Instrumentation Ltd., Kota.
3. Shri K. Eswaran, Managing Director, M/s. Kackbridge Hewittic & & Easun Ltd., Madras.
4. Shri A. S. Lakshman, Chairman, M/s. Senapatty Whitely Ltd., Bangalore.

2. The Central Government also directs that the following amendments shall be made in the said Order:—

- (1) After entry No. 24 relating to Shri P. V. Mathai (CEDB), the following entries shall be inserted namely:—

25. Shri S. S. Kakade, Managing Director General Manager, M/s. NGEF, Bangalore.

26. Brig. B. J. Shahaney, Managing Director, M/s. Instrumentation Ltd., KOTA.

27. Shri K. Eswaran, Managing Director, M/s. Hackbridge Hewitt & Eason Ltd., MADRAS.

28. Shri A. S. Lakshman, Chairman, M/s. Senapatty Whitely Ltd., BANGALORE.

[No. EEI-19(18)/72]

R. KRISHNASWAMY, Dy. Secy.

**कृषि मंत्रालय
(सामुदायिक विकास विभाग)**

नई दिल्ली, 13 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 965.—जांच आयोग अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 60) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उस कालावधि को जिसके भीतर भारत सेवक समाज के मामलों और लेखाओं की जांच करने के लिए भारत सरकार के सामुदायिक विकास विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या 9(2)/68-एल. के. के. तारीख 21 फरवरी, 1969 द्वारा नियुक्त जांच आयोग अपनी रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को देगा को 30 अप्रैल, 1973 तक और बढ़ाती हैं।

[सं. एल. 14012/1/72-पी. सी]

एम. ए. कुरेशी, सचिव

**MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
(Department of Community Development)**

New Delhi, the 13th March, 1973

S.O. 965.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Commission of Inquiry Act 1952 (60 of 1952) the Central Government hereby further extend up to 30th April, 1973, the period within which the Commission of Inquiry to look into the affairs and accounts of Bharat Sewak Samaj, appointed by the Government of India in the Department of Community Development vide Notification No. 9(2)/68-IKK dated 21st February, 1969, shall make its report to the Central Government.

[No. L. 14012/1/72-PC]

M. A. QURAIŞHI, Secy.

पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 15 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 966.—अंतराष्ट्रीय विमानपत्तन प्राधिकारी अधिनियम 1971 (1971 का 43) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एयर इण्डिया के प्रबन्ध निदेशक, श्री के. के. उन्नी को 14 फरवरी, 1973 से एयर मार्शल एम. एस. चतुर्वेदी के स्थान पर भारत के अंतराष्ट्रीय विमानपत्तन प्राधिकारी के एक अंश-कालिक सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती हैं।

[सं. ए-11013/8/71-प्रशासन]

टी. आरुमगम्, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION

New Delhi, the 15th March, 1973

S.O. 966.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the International Airports Authority Act 1971, (43 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. K. Unni, Managing Director, Air India, as a part-time Member of the International Airports Authority of India, with effect from 14th February, 1973, vice Air Marshal M. S. Chaturvedi.

[No. A-11013/8/71-Admn.]

T. ARUMUGHAM, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 967.—यतः 15 मार्च, 1973 को, इंडियन एयरलाइंस का एक एच. एस.-748 विमान बी.टी.-ई.ए.यू. जब एक स्थानीय प्रशिक्षण उड़ान कर रहा था, बेगमपट विमानक्षेत्र से लगभग 3 मील की दूरी पर सिकंदराबाद में दीक्षणा मध्य रेलवे के मुख्यालय के पास दुर्घटनाग्रस्त हो गया, जिसके परिणामस्वरूप विमान पर सवार कैप्टन तथा दो अन्य विमानचालकों की मृत्यु हो गयी तथा भूमि पर एक लड़के को प्राणघातक चोटें तथा एक महिला को गंभीर चोटें लगीं ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार अनुभव करती हैं कि उक्त दुर्घटना की परिस्थितियों की औपचारिक जांच करना वांछनीय है ;

अतः, अब, वायुयान निगम, 1937 के नियम 75 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निदेश करती हैं कि उक्त दुर्घटना की औपचारिक जांच की जाए।

केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त जांच करने के लिए आंध्र प्रदेश के उच्च न्यायालय के न्यायाधीश, श्री एल्लाडी कृष्णस्वामी को नियुक्त करती हैं।

केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त जांच करने के लिए असंसारों के रूप में कार्य करने के लिए निम्नीलिखित को भी नियुक्त करती हैं :—

(1) विंग कमांडर एस. एस. मल्होत्रा, मार्फत वायु सेना मुख्यालय, नई दिल्ली, तथा

(2) श्री जे. सेन, नागर विमानन विभाग में प्रशिक्षण तथा लाइसेंसिंग के सेवा निवृत्त निदेशक।

आशा की जाती है कि जांच अदालत 25 अप्रैल, 1973 तक अपनी जांच पूरी कर लेगी एवं केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट भी प्रस्तुत कर देगी।

[फा. सं. ए.बी. 15013/9/73-ए]

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1973

S.O. 967.—Whereas on the 15th March, 1973, an Indian Airlines' HS-748 aircraft VT-EAU, while engaged on a local training flight crashed near the South Central Railway headquarters in Secunderabad, about 3 miles away from Begumpet aerodrome, resulting in the death of the Captain and two other pilots on board the aircraft and fatal injuries to a boy and serious injuries to a woman on the ground;

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is expedient to hold formal investigation into the circumstances of the said accident;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by rule 75 of the Aircraft Rules, 1937, the Central Government hereby directs that a formal investigation of the said accident be held.

The Central Government is further pleased to appoint Shri Justice Alladi Kuppaswami of Andhra Pradesh High Court to hold the said investigation.

The Central Government is also pleased to appoint—

(i) Wing Commander S. S. Malhotra, c/o Air Headquarters, New Delhi, and

(ii) Shri J. Sen, Retd. Director of Training and Licensing, Civil Aviation Department.

to act as Assessors to the said investigation.

The Court of Inquiry will be expected to complete its inquiry and make its report to the Central Government by 25th April, 1973.

[F. No. Av. 15013/9/73-A]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 मार्च, 1973

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd March, 1973

का० प्रा० 968.—वायुयान नियम, 1937 के नियम 3 के उप-नियम (2) का अनुसरण करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नागर विमानन महानिदेशक को नीचे दी गयी अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 2 में विनिर्दिष्ट प्रकार से, उक्त अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 3 में तदनुसूची प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट सीमा तक किसी विमानचालक अथवा विमानचालकों की श्रेणी को उक्त नियमों के उपबंधों के प्रवर्तन से छूट देने के लिये उक्त नियमों के नियम 160 द्वारा प्रवर्तन शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने का अधिकार देती है।

2. यह आदेश इसके सरकारी राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिये वैध होगा।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	उक्त नियमों का उपबंध जिसके संबंध में छूट देने की शक्ति का प्रयोग किया जाना है	ऐसी शक्ति के प्रयोग की सीमा
1.	अनुसूची II के खंड "घ", "ङ", तथा "च" के पैरा 3 का उप-पैरा (ख)	ऐसे विमान चालकों को, जो इण्डियन एयरलाइंस अथवा एयर इण्डिया में अतिपरिष्कृत तथा भारी प्रकार के सार्वजनिक परिवहन विमानों पर प्रशिक्षण प्राप्त कर रहे हैं, उनके लाइसेंसों के नवीकरण के लिये स्तम्भ 2 में निर्दिष्ट उपबंधों में निर्धारित उड़ान अनुभव तथा कौशल अपेक्षाओं के संबंध में इनके ह्रास के होने की शर्त से छूट देना, बशर्त कि नागर विमानन महानिदेशक इस बात से संतुष्ट हो कि सुरक्षा के मानकों को किसी प्रकार का खतरा नहीं है।

[फा० सं० ए०बी० 11013/10/72-ए/प्रार०/1937/1973]

सुरेन्द्र नाथ कोल, उप सचिव

S.O. 968.—In pursuance of sub-rule (2) of rule 3 of the Aircraft Rules, 1937, the Central Government hereby authorise the Director-General of Civil Aviation to exercise the powers conferred on it by rule 160 of the said rules, to exempt any pilot or pilots from the operation of the provisions of the said rules as specified in column 2 of the Schedule given below to the extent specified in the corresponding entry in column 3 of the said Schedule.

2. This order shall be valid for a period of one year with effect from the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

S.No. Provision of the said rules for which power to exempt is to be exercised. Extent of application of such power.

1. Sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 3 of sections 'D', 'E' and 'F' of Schedule II.	To exempt such of the pilots undergoing training in Indian Airlines or Air India on sophisticated and heavier type of public transport aircraft from recency requirements in respect of flying experience and skill requirements for the renewal of their licences stipulated in the provisions referred to in column (2) provided the Director General of Civil Aviation is satisfied that standards of safety are not compromised.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

(F.No. Av.11013/10/72-A/AR/1937/1973)

S. N. KAUL, Deputy Secy.

नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय

(सीमा पथ विकास बोर्ड)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 15 मार्च, 1973

का० प्रा० 969.—केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम, 1965 के नियम 9 के उप-नियम (2), नियम 12 के उप-नियम (2) के खण्ड (ख) और नियम 24 के उप-नियम (1) द्वारा प्रवर्तन शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, राष्ट्रपति एतद्वारा निदेश देते हैं कि:—

(1) इस आदेश की अनुसूची के भाग I के स्तम्भ I में निर्दिष्ट सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवा, श्रेणी II के पदों के बारे में, स्तम्भ 2 में निर्दिष्ट प्राधिकारी नियुक्ति प्राधिकारी होगा और स्तम्भ 3 में निर्दिष्ट प्राधिकारी, स्तम्भ 4 में निर्दिष्ट शास्ति के लिये अनुशासन प्राधिकारी होगा;

(2) उक्त अनुसूची के भाग II के स्तम्भ 1 और भाग III में निर्दिष्ट सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवा, श्रेणी III और सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवा, श्रेणी IV के पदों के बारे में, स्तम्भ 2 में निर्दिष्ट प्राधिकारी नियुक्ति प्राधिकारी होगा और स्तम्भ 3 और 5 में शास्ति के निर्दिष्ट प्राधिकारी स्तम्भ 4 में निर्दिष्ट शास्ति के लिये क्रमशः अनुशासन प्राधिकारी और अपील प्राधिकारी होंगे।

अनुसूची

पद का विवरण	नियुक्ति प्राधिकारी	शास्ति के लिए सक्षम अधिकारी और शास्ति जो कि वह दे सकता है (केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवाओं के नियम 11 की मद संख्याओं के संदर्भ में (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम, 1965	अपील प्राधिकारी	
		प्राधिकारी	शास्ति	
1	2	3	4	5

भाग I—सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवा, श्रेणी II

महानिदेशालय सीमा सड़क

सभी श्रेणी II पद	राष्ट्रपति	राष्ट्रपति महानिदेशालय सीमा सड़क	सभी	(1) से (4)
------------------	------------	----------------------------------	-----	------------

भाग II—सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवा, श्रेणी III

महानिदेशालय सीमा सड़क

1. महानिदेशक, सीमा सड़क के मुख्य कार्यालय में सभी श्रेणी III के पद	निदेशक (संगठन और कार्मिक)	निदेशक (संगठन और कार्मिक)	सभी	महानिदेशक सीमा सड़क
2. कृतिक बल तथा बेस वर्कशाप सहित परियोजनाओं में सभी श्रेणी III के पद	मुख्य इंजीनियर (परियोजना)	मुख्य इंजीनियर (परियोजना)	सभी	महानिदेशक सीमा सड़क
3. (क) कृतिक बल (ख) बेस वर्कशाप के निम्नलिखित वर्गों में दिये गए पदों के अतिरिक्त सभी श्रेणी III पद	(क) कमान अधिकारी, मुख्य कार्यालय कृतिक बल (लेफ्टि-नेंट कर्नल/अधीक्षक इंजीनियर)	(क) कमान अधिकारी, प्रधान कार्यालय कृतिक बल (लेफ्टि-नेंट कर्नल/अधीक्षक इंजीनियर)	सभी	मुख्य इंजीनियर (परियोजना)
(1) फोरमेन (2) फोरमेन (सिगनल) (3) चार्जमेन (ड्रिलिंग के व्यक्तियों सहित) (4) चार्जमेन (सिगनल) (5) पर्यवेक्षक गैर तकनीकी वर्ग I (6) अधीक्षक भवन/सड़क वर्ग I, कार्य-भारी अधिकारी, उप-डिवीजन (7) अधीक्षक विद्युत/यांत्रिक, वर्ग I, कार्यभारी अधिकारी, उप-डिवीजन (8) अधीक्षक भवन/सड़क वर्ग I (9) अधीक्षक विद्युत/यांत्रिक वर्ग I (10) पर्यवेक्षक बैरक/भण्डार वर्ग I (11) मुख्य नक्शानवीस/अनुमानक (12) वरिष्ठ नक्शानवीस (13) सर्वेक्षक सहायक वर्ग I (14) अधीक्षक लिपिक (15) सहायक कार्यभारी (16) निरीक्षक के व्यक्तिगत सहायक	(ख) कमान अधिकारी, प्रधान कार्यालय कृतिक बल [लेफ्टि-नेंट कर्नल/अधीक्षक इंजीनियर (यांत्रिक)]	(ख) कमान अधिकारी, प्रधान कार्यालय कृतिक बल, [लेफ्टि-नेंट कर्नल/अधीक्षक इंजीनियर (यांत्रिक)]	सभी	मुख्य इंजीनियर (परियोजना)
4. सामान्य आरक्षण इंजीनियर बल केन्द्र अवर सामान्य आरक्षण इंजीनियर बल रिकार्ड	कमान अधिकारी सामान्य आर-क्षण इंजीनियर बल केन्द्र	(क) मुख्य इंजीनियर (परि-योजना) (ख) उक्त स्तम्भ 1 में मद 3 के अंतर्गत उपमद (1) से (16) में उल्लिखित पदों के अतिरिक्त पदों के संबंध में कमान अधिकारी सामान्य आरक्षण इंजीनियर बल केन्द्र	सभी	महानिदेशक सीमा सड़क मुख्य इंजीनियर (परियोजना)

1	2	3	4	5
भाग III—सामान्य केन्द्रीय सेवा, श्रेणी IV				
महानिदेशालय सामान्य सीमा सड़क				
(1) महानिदेशक सीमा सड़क के मुख्य कार्यालय में सभी श्रेणी 4 पद	निदेशक (संगठन) और वैयक्तिक।	निदेशक (संगठन और वैयक्तिक)	सभी	महानिदेशक सीमा सड़क
(2) परियोजनाओं में सभी श्रेणी 4 पद	मुख्य इंजीनियर (परियोजना)	मुख्य इंजीनियर (परियोजना)	सभी	महानिदेशक सीमा सड़क
(3) (क) कृषिक बल और (ख) बेस वर्कशाप में सभी श्रेणी 4 पद	(क) कमान अधिकारी, प्रधान कार्यालय, कृषिक बल (लेफ्टिनेंट कर्नेल/अधीक्षक इंजीनियर) (ख) कमान अधिकारी, बेस वर्कशाप (लेफ्टिनेंट कर्नेल/अधीक्षक इंजीनियर (यांत्रिक))	कमान अधिकारी प्रधान कार्यालय कृषिक बल (लेफ्टिनेंट कर्नेल/अधीक्षक इंजीनियर) (ख) कमान अधिकारी बेस वर्कशाप (लेफ्टिनेंट कर्नेल/अधीक्षक इंजीनियर (यांत्रिक))	सभी	मुख्य इंजीनियर (परियोजना)
4. सामान्य आरक्षण इंजीनियर बल केन्द्र और सामान्य आरक्षण इंजीनियर बल रिकार्ड में सभी श्रेणी 4 पद	कमान अधिकारी सामान्य आरक्षण इंजीनियर बल केन्द्र	(क) मुख्य इंजीनियर (परियोजना) (ख) कमान अधिकारी सामान्य आरक्षण इंजीनियर बल केन्द्र	सभी	महानिदेशक सीमा सड़क मुख्य इंजीनियर (परियोजना)

[सं० एक-81 (16)/1969-भर्ती]

बी० के पवार, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT
(Border Roads Development Board)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 15th March, 1973

S. O. 969.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and sub-rule (1) of rule 24 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, the President hereby directs that:—

- (1) in respect of the posts in the General Central Service, Class II, specified in column 1 of Part I of the Schedule to this Order, the authority specified in column 2 shall be the Appointing Authority and the authority specified in column 3 shall be the Disciplinary Authority in regard to the penalties specified in column 4;
- (2) in respect of the posts in the General Central Service, Class III and the General Central Service Class IV, specified in column 1 of Part II and Part III of the said Schedule, the authority specified in column 2 shall be the Appointing Authority and the authority specified in columns 3 and 5 shall be the Disciplinary Authority and the Appellate Authority respectively in regard to the penalties specified in column 4.

SCHEDULE

Description of post	Appointing Authority	Authority competent to impose penalties and penalties which it may impose [with reference to item numbers in rule 11 of Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal)] Rules, 1965	Appellate Authority.	
		Authority	Penalties	
1	2	3	4	5
PART I—General Central Service, Class II				
Directorate General Border Roads				
All Class II posts	President	President Director General Border Roads	All	(i) to (iv)
PART II—General Central Service, Class III				
Directorate General Border Roads				
1. All Class III posts in the Headquarters Director General Border Roads . . .	Director (Organisation and Personnel)	Director (Organisation and Personnel)	All	Director General Border Roads.
2. All Class III posts in Projects including Task Forces and Base Workshops.	Chief Engineers (Projects)	Chief Engineers (Projects)	All	Director General Border Roads.

1	2	3	4	5
3. All Class III posts other than those in the following categories in (a) Task Forces (b) Base Workshops:-	(a) Commanding Officers Headquarters Task Forces (Lieutenant Colonel/Superintending Engineer)	(a) Commanding Officers Headquarters Task Forces (Lieutenant Colonel/Superintending Engineer)	All	Chief Engineers (Projects)
(i) Foreman	(b) Commanding Officer of Base Workshops (Lieutenant Colonel/Superintending Engineer (Mechanical)	(b) Commanding Officers of Base Workshops (Lieutenant Colonel) Superintending Engineer (Mechanical)	All	Chief Engineers (Projects)
(ii) Foreman (Signals)				
(iii) Chargeman (including those in charge of drilling)				
(iv) Chargeman (Signals)				
(v) Supervisor Non-Technical Grade I				
(vi) Superintendent Building/Roads Grade I in charge of sub Division				
(vii) Superintendent Electrical/Mechanical Grade I in charge of Sub-Division.				
(viii) Superintendent Building/Roads Grade I.				
(ix) Superintendent Electrical/Mechanical Grade I.				
(x) Supervisor Barrack/Stores Grade I.				
(xi) Chief Draughtsman/Estimator				
(xii) Senior Draughtsman				
(xiii) Surveyor Assistant Grade I.				
(xiv) Superintendent Clerical				
(xv) Assistant-in-Charge				
(xvi) Personal Assistant to Brigadier				
4. All Class III posts in General Reserve Engineer Force Centre and General Reserve Engineer Force Records.	Commander General Reserve Engineer Force Centre.	(a) Chief Engineer (Project). (b) Commander General Reserve Engineer Force Centre for posts other than those mentioned in sub-items (i) to (xvi) under item 3 in column 1 above.	All All	Director General Border Roads. Chief Engineer (Project).

PART III—General Central Service, Class IV
Directorate General Border Roads

1. All Class IV posts in the Headquarters Directorate General Border Roads	Director (Organisation and Personnel)	Director (organisation and Personnel)	All	Director General Border Roads.
2. All Class IV posts in Projects.	Chief Engineers (Projects)	Chief Engineers (Projects)	All	Director General Border Roads.
3. All Class IV posts in (a) Task Forces and (b) Base Workshops.	(a) Commanding Officers Headquarters Task Forces (Lieutenant Colonel/Superintending Engineer)	(a) Commanding Officers Headquarters Task Forces (Lieutenant Colonel/Superintending Engineer)	All	Chief Engineers (Projects)
	(b) Commanding Officers of Base Workshops (Lieutenant Colonel/Superintending Engineer (Mechanical)	(b) Commanding Officers of Base Workshops (Lieutenant Colonel/Superintending Engineer (Mechanical)	All	Chief Engineers (Projects)
4. All Class IV posts in General Reserve Engineer Force Centre and General Reserve Engineer Force Records.	Commander General Reserve Engineer Force Centre.	(a) Chief Engineer (Project) (b) Commander General Reserve Engineer Force Centre.	All All	Director General Border Roads. Chief Engineer (Project).

[No. F.81(16)/1969-Rectt.]

B. K. PAWAR, Under Secy.

**संचार मंत्रालय
(डाक-तार बोर्ड)**

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 970.—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम 1951 के नियम 434 के खण्ड 3 के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने हल्द्वानी टेलीफोन केंद्र में दिनांक 16-4-73 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निर्णय किया है।

[सं. 5-2/73 पी.एच.बी.(21)]

**MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS
(P & T Board)**

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1973

S.O. 970.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 16-4-1973 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in HALDWANI Telephone Exchange, U.P. Circle.

[No. 5-2/73-PHB(21)]

नई दिल्ली, 27 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 971.—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम 1951 के नियम 434 के खण्ड 3 के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक करीम गंज टेलीफोन केंद्र में दिनांक 16-4-73 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निर्णय किया है।

[सं. 5-22/73 पी.एच.बी.(3)]

ए. एस. वोहरा, सहायक महानिदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th March, 1973

S.O. 971.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 16-4-1973 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in KARIMGANJ Telephone Exchange, North Eastern Circle.

[No. 5-22/73-PHB(3)]

A. S. VOHRA, Assistant Director General (PHB)

निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय

(सम्पदा निदेशालय)

नई दिल्ली, 21 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 972.—लोक परिसर (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बंक्खली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत सरकार के निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय, सम्पदा निदेशालय की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 127, तारीख 4 जनवरी 1973 में एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना के नीचे की सारणी में,

(1) स्तंभ 1 में, क्रम सं. 2 के सामने विद्यमान प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“संयंत्र अधीक्षक/नगर प्रशासक/सम्पदा अधिकारी, हिन्दुस्तान मशीन टूलस लिमिटेड 3 मशीन टूलस फैक्ट्री एस्टेट, पिन्जौर, जिला अम्बाला (हरियाणा)”।

(2) स्तंभ 1 में क्रम सं. 15 के सामने विद्यमान प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

“क्षेत्र महाप्रबंधक, राष्ट्रीय कांयला विकास निगम, लिमिटेड, विशारामपुर, डाकखाना विशारामपुर, जिला सरगुजा (मध्यप्रदेश)”।

[फा. सं. 21012(13)/72-पोल. 3]

आर. बी. सखसेना, सम्पदा उपनिदेशक
और पढ़ने अवर सचिव

**MINISTRY OF WORKS AND HOUSING
(Directorate of Estates)**

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1973

S.O. 972.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Works and Housing, Directorate of Estates No. S.O. 127 dated the 4th January, 1973, namely:—

In the Table below the said notification,

(i) against Serial No. 2, in column 1, for the existing entry, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“Superintendent Plant/Town Administrator/Estate Officer, Hindustan Machine Tools Limited, III Machine Tools Factory Estate, Pinjore, District Ambala (Haryana)”.

(ii) against Serial No. 15, in column 1, for the existing entry, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“Area General Manager, National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Bishrampur, P.O. Bishrampur, Distt: Surguja (M.P.)”.

[F. No. 21012(13)/72-Pol. III]

R. B. SAXENA, Dy. Director of Estates
and Ex-Officio Under Secy.

दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण

नई दिल्ली, 31 मार्च, 1973

सार्वजनिक सूचना

का. आ. 973.—दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण मुख्य योजना/क्षेत्रीय योजना में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करने का विचार कर रहा है। इसे सार्वजनिक सूचना के लिए प्रकाशित किया जा रहा है। इस संशोधन के संबंध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को आपत्ति या सुझाव देना हो तो वे अपने आपत्ति/सुझाव इस ज्ञापन के 30 दिन के भीतर सचिव, दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण, दिल्ली विकास भवन, इन्द्रप्रस्थ इस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-1 के पास लिखित रूप में भेज सकते हैं। जो व्यक्ति अपनी आपत्ति/सुझाव देते हैं अपना नाम तथा पूरा पता भी लिखें।

संशोधन

“लगभग 5.42 हेक्टर का क्षेत्र जो उत्तरपूर्व में 9.4 मीटर चौड़ी सड़क, दक्षिण पूर्व में 30.5 मीटर चौड़ी चन्द्र गुप्ता रोड, दक्षिण-पश्चिम में 30.5 मीटर चौड़ी सड़क तथा उत्तर-पश्चिम में 30.5 मीटर चौड़ी सड़क द्वारा घिरा हुआ है, तथा यह क्षेत्र जॉन डी-13 (वाणव्यपूरी) में तथा उत्तर-पश्चिम में 30.5 मीटर चौड़ी सड़क द्वारा (अस्पताल) से “आवासीय” में परिवर्तित करने का प्रस्ताव है”।

शनिवार को छोड़ सभी कार्यशील दिनों में दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण के कार्यालय, विकास भवन, इन्द्रप्रस्था इस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-1 में उक्त अधिध में आकर प्रस्तावित संशोधन के मान-चित्रों का निरीक्षण किया जा सकता है।

[एफ 16(49)/71-एम.पी.]

हृदयनाथ फातेदार, सचिव

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

New Delhi, the 31st March, 1973

PUBLIC NOTICE

S.O. 973.—The following modification which the Delhi Development Authority proposes to make in the Master Plan/Zonal Plan for Delhi is hereby published for public information. Any person having any objection or suggestion with respect to the proposed change may send the objection/suggestion in writing to the Secretary, Delhi Development Authority, Delhi Vikas Bhawan, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi-1 within 30 days from the date of this notice. The person making the objection/suggestion should also give his name and address.

MODIFICATION

"An area, measuring about 5.42 Hects. bounded by 9.4 meters wide road in the north-east, 30.5 metres wide Chandra Gupta Road in the south-east, 30.5 meters wide road in the south-west and 30.5 meters wide road in north west, falling in Zone D-13 Chanakayapuri is proposed to be changed from "Public and Semi-public" use (Hospital) to "Residential".

The plan indicating the proposed modifications will be available for inspection at the office of the Authority, Delhi Vikas Bhawan, Indraprastha Estate, New Delhi on all working days except Saturdays with the period referred to above.

[No. F. 16(49)/71-M.P.]

H. N. FOTEDAR, Secy.

सिंचाई और विद्युत मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 17 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 974.—लक्कादीव, मिनिक्कोय और अमीनदीवी द्वीप समूह (विधि) सं. 2 विनियम 1970 (1970 का 2) की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निदेश देती है कि भारतीय विद्युत् अधिनियम 1910 (1910 का 2) और भारत विद्युत् नियम 1956 के निम्नलिखित उपबंधों के अधीन राज्य सरकार या समुचित सरकार की शक्तियों का प्रयोग और कृत्यों का निर्वहन, लक्कादीव, मिनिक्कोय और अमीनदीवी द्वीप समूह के सम्बन्ध में, केवल केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा न कि उक्त रांध राज्य क्षेत्र के प्रशासक द्वारा किया जाएगा, अर्थात्

भारतीय विद्युत् अधिनियम 1910 की धारा 13, 18, 34, 36, 55 और अनुसूची का खण्ड 13 तथा भारतीय विद्युत् नियम 1956 के नियम 6, 133 और 134.

[सं. स. वि. 2-4/4/67]

एम. रामनाथन, उप निदेशक (विद्युत्)

MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

New Delhi, the 17th March, 1973

S.O. 974.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands (Laws) No. 2 Regulation, 1970 (2 of 1970), the Central Government hereby directs that the powers and functions of the State Government or the appropriate Government under the following provisions of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 (9 of 1910) and the Indian Electricity Rules, 1956 shall in relation to the Union territory of Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands, be exercised and discharged only by the Central Government and not by the Administrator of the said Union Territory namely—

Sections 13, 18, 34, 36, 55 and clause XIII of the Schedule to the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 and rules 6, 133 and 134 of the Indian Electricity Rules, 1956.

[No. EL. II-4(4)/67]

M. RAMANATHAN, Dy. Director, (Power).

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 20th March, 1973

S.O. 975.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of Shri H. H. Quraishy, Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Dhanbad and Arbitrator, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Digwadih Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th March, 1973.

ARBITRATION AWARD GIVEN BY SHRI H. H. QURAIISHY, REGIONAL LABOUR COMMISSIONER (C), DHANBAD AND ARBITRATOR UNDER SECTION 10A OF THE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947 IN THE MATTER OF AN INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE BETWEEN THE MANAGEMENT OF DIGWADIH COLLIERY OF M/S. TATA IRON AND STEEL COMPANY LIMITED, P. O. JEALGORA, DISTT. DHANBAD AND THEIR WORKMEN REPRESENTED BY COLLIERY MAZDOOR SANGH (INTUC), RAJENDRA PATH, DHANBAD.

Present :

Shri H. H. Quraishy, Regional Labour Commissioner (C), Dhanbad & Arbitrator.

Representing the Management :

1. Shri R. K. Verma, Group Personnel & Welfare Officer (Central), M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company Limited, P. O. Jealgora, Distt. Dhanbad.

Representing the Workmen :

1. Shri Lala B. P. Sinha, Organising Secretary, Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

State: Bihar.

Industry: Coal.

Dhanbad, 28th February, 1973

AWARD

By an agreement dated 11-10-1972, the Management of Digwadih Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company Limited, P.O. Jealgora, Distt. Dhanbad and their workmen represented by Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad referred the following industrial dispute for my arbitration under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

"Whether the demand of Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad that Shri Mandip, Ex-C.R.O. Labour, Digwadih Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Co.

Ltd., P. O. Jealgora, Distt. Dhanbad who was dismissed with effect from 28-3-1970 should be reinstated without back wages is justified? If so, to what relief the concerned workman is entitled?"

2. The Parties further agreed that my decision as Arbitrator shall be binding on them and that the award shall be made within a period of six months from the date of signing of the agreement or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between the parties in writing.

3. The said arbitration agreement was published vide Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Rehabilitation, Deptt. of Labour and Employment Notification No. I./2025/28/72-LR dated 25-10-72.

4. Both the Union and the Management were requested under my letter dated 16-11-1972 to furnish their written statement. After receipt of the written statement from the management and the Union on 20-12-72, I fixed up hearing on 25th January, 1973 in my office. The Union representative attended on the said date but the management representative failed to attend. The Management, however, explained that my letter dated 22-1-73 fixing the date of hearing was received by them on 29-1-73 and hence they could not attend on 25-1-73. The next date of hearing was accordingly fixed on 22-2-73 in my office when both the parties duly attended.

5. The case made out by the Union as given in their statement is that Shri Mandip, Ex. C.R.O. Labour of Digwadih Colliery has been working since long with satisfaction to all concerned. He was chargesheeted for alleged misbehaviour with another workman and after a show of enquiry he was dismissed with effect from 28-3-1970. The Union pointed out that the cause of action against the workman concerned arose out of a quarrel between him and another workman. Since both of them reconciled and submitted a joint petition to the management withdrawing their case, there was no dispute. As such the action of the management in dismissing one of them for alleged misbehaviour is unjustified and discriminatory.

6. The management in their written statement has submitted that Shri Mandip assaulted Shri Rajendra Ram, Munshi on 10-1-70 on duty in C shift and was charge sheeted for the above misconduct. A departmental enquiry was held in the matter wherein Shri Mandip participated and cross examined the prosecution witness. Thus the workman concerned was given full opportunity in the departmental enquiry which was conducted after observing the principles of natural justice. As the misconduct was proved beyond doubt in the departmental enquiry and the charge was fully established, the workman concerned was dismissed from Company's service w.e.f. 28-3-1970. The management further submitted that assault on a Superior Officer underground is a very grave offence. A compromise petition did not mitigate the seriousness of the offence and action was called for to maintain discipline in the industry. The management in support of their contention submitted documents mentioned below marked as Exhibits M-1 to M-9.

1. Application dated 10-1-70 of Shri Rajendra Ram, Munshi (Exhibit M-1).
2. Original charge sheet No. 5 dated 17-1-70 issued to Sri Mandip together with its reply (Ext. M-2).
3. Enquiry letter No. Dig/PD/69/35 dated 10-2-70 (Ext. M-3).
4. Letter No. Dig/PD-70/47 dated 19-2-70 (Ext. M-4).
5. Letter No. Dig/PD-70/49 dated 24-2-70 (Ext. M-5).
6. Original enquiry proceedings in 15 pages (Ext. M-6).
7. Original findings of the Enquiry Officer dated 4-2-70 in 3 page (Ext. M-7).
8. Letter No. AJ6/31/773/70 dated 20-3-70 (Dismissal Letter-Ext-M-8).
9. Copy of Standing Orders (Ext-M-9).

7. At the time of hearing, the Union representative stated that the workman has been chargesheeted for assaulting Shri Rajendra Ram, Munshi, but the fact is that there was no assault as such. What happened that both these employees quarrelled with each other. While Shri Mandip did not lodge any complaint, Shri Rajendra Ram lodged a written complaint before the management, although Shri Rajendra Ram first hit Shri Mandip with his stick. When Shri Mandip came to know of this he also verbally complained to the management about the quarrel but no action was taken against Shri Rajendra Ram, Munshi. The Union representative contended that it was fair and reasonable for the management to chargesheet both of them for quarrelling while on duty. The management picked up only Shri Mandip and let off Shri Rajendra Ram which is discriminatory and amounts to victimisation.

8. Ext. M-6 is the enquiry proceedings in 15 pages. It is seen from the enquiry proceedings that only one witness viz. Shri N. Mishra, Overman was examined on behalf of the management besides the complainant Shri Rajendra Ram. It is interesting to note from the evidence of Shri Mishra that he was not an eyewitness to the alleged assault on Shri Rajendra Ram, Munshi but was informed by Shri Moti, C.R.O. Trammer that Shri Rajendra Ram was assaulted by Shri Mandip. He had further stated in his statement before the enquiry officer that "Shri Mandip told me that he was beaten first by Shri Rajendra Ram, Munshi with his stick in his right hand and that he assaulted him." Thus there is no direct evidence on record to prove the alleged misconduct. In all fairness the management should have examined the other witnesses in whose presence the alleged incident of assault took place. The evidence of Shri Mishra is only a secondary evidence based on certain reports made to him. Therefore it is not safe to rely entirely on the evidence of Shri Mishra especially when the delinquent workman had made counter allegations on the complainant. It is also seen that both the workmen submitted compromise petition and requested the enquiry Officer not to proceed further in the matter. This itself suggests that the story of quarrel put forth by the delinquent workman was not entirely baseless. Had it not been so, the complainant would have not agreed for any compromise.

9. Thus from the foregoing paras, the demand of the Colliery Mazdoor Sangh for re-instatement of Shri Mandip without back wages seems to me to be justified and accordingly I award that Shri Mandip should be re-instated without back wages.

This is my award and the reference for my arbitration thus stands disposed of.

H. H. QURAI SHY, Regional Labour Commissioner
Dhanbad, 28th February, 1973

[No. L-2025/28/72-LRII.]

New Delhi, the 21st March, 1973

S.O. 976.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh in respect of a complaint under section 33A of the said Act filed by Shri Katku, Beldar, Token No. 699-B, which was received by the Central Government on 12th March, 1973.

BEFORE SHRI P. P. R. SAWHNY, B.A. (HONS.) CANTAB
BAR-AT-LAW, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL), CHANDIGARH.

Complaint No. 2/21 of 1972

under section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Shri Katku, Beldar, Token No : 699-B, Harabagh Tunnelling Division, B.S.L. Project, Sundernagar—Complainant.

Vs.

1. Superintending Engineer, Harabagh Tunnelling Division, B.S.L., Sundernagar (H.P.).
2. Executive Engineer, Harabagh Tunnelling Circle, B.S.L. Project, Sundernagar (H.P.).—Respondents.

Appearances :

Shri Mohinder Singh—for the complainant.

Shri Rattan Lal—for the respondents.

AWARD

Shri Katku, complainant, has maintained in the complaint that he had been imposed a punishment of stoppage of annual increment without considering the reply that he had given to the show cause notice in respect of the allegation that he had been caught red handed while pilfering 12 battons (wooden) of 88×3×3" size from the carpentry shop and that he had not exercised proper check on the aforesaid pilferage.

According to him, he had filed an appeal before the Superintending Engineer against the wrongful findings of the enquiry officer, who had rejected the same without giving any reasons, and that at the time of infliction of punishment by the Execution Engineer, respondent No. 2, a dispute forming subject matter of reference No. 2/C of 1971 was pending, and the impugned action had been taken without securing prior permission of this Tribunal, which tantamounted to contravention of the provisions of section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

2. In the reply that was filed by the respondents to the complaint, a preliminary objection was taken that the Tribunal had no jurisdiction to entertain the instant complaint and that it was not maintainable as the complainant had been punished for a misconduct as envisaged under clause 7(b)(vi) of the certified standing orders which was not connected with the dispute forming subject matter of reference No. 2/C of 1971.

On merits, the justification for the action taken has been given in it and it has been maintained that there was no necessity for seeking prior permission from this Tribunal, in view of the fact that the annual increment of the complainant was not stopped for any misconduct or any matter connected with subject matter of reference No. 2/C of 1971, inasmuch as the charge under clause 17(b)(vi) of the certified standing orders in respect of non-factory staff had been proved against the complainant, and the enquiry that had been held was consistent with principles of natural justice and full opportunity had been provided to the complainant to produce defence.

3. No written rejoinder was put in by the complainant to the reply filed by the respondents, but he verbally controverted the pleas raised by the respondents in their reply, in respect of the preliminary objections as well as in respect of merits.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed :—

Preliminary issue :

Whether this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain the instant complaint as according to the respondents the complainant had been punished for a misconduct as envisaged under clause 17(b)(vi) of the certified standing orders, and not in any matter connected with the dispute forming subject matter of reference No. 2/C of 1971?

On Merits :

Whether the respondents were justified in inflicting the punishment of stoppage of annual increment during the pendency of reference No. 2/C of 1971, without taking prior permission and without taking into consideration the reply of the concerned workman to the show cause notice sent vide letter No. 17636/IF/WC, dated 17-12-71, forming subject of annexure 'B' to the complaint?

5. The charge on the basis of which annual increment of Shri Katku has been stopped is not in any way connected with the matter in dispute, forming subject matter of reference No. 2/C of 1971, which was pending at that time, and as such it is held that there was no necessity for the

respondents to have secured prior permission for taking the action, regarding which the complaint has been made.

That being so, the complaint is held to be not maintainable and award is given accordingly.

P. P. R. SAWHNY, Presiding Officer

[No. L. 42012/1/73/LRIII]

New Delhi, the 23rd March, 1973

S.O.977.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs. Madhujore Coal Company Private Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 17th March, 1973.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT
CALCUTTA**

Reference No. 38 of 1972

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs. Madhujore Coal Company Private Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan.

AND

Their workmen.

Present :

Sri S. N. Bagchi, Presiding Officer.

Appearances :

On behalf of Employers—None.

On behalf of Workmen—None.

State : West Bengal.

Industry : Coal Mine.

AWARD

By Order No. L/19012/13/72-LR. II dated the 9th June, 1972, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred the following industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs. Madhujore Coal Company Private Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan and their workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, namely :

"Whether the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs. Madhujore Coal Company Private Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan is justified in stopping from work Shri Ramakhan Shaw, Mining Sirdar, with effect from the 16th November, 1971? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. This case was fixed for admission of the memorandum of compromise filed earlier, if law so permits or for submission of views of parties about the case on 7-3-1973. The case was also fixed for the similar purpose on 22-1-1973 and 9-2-73 but nobody appears from either side though the notices of this Tribunal were duly served upon them.

3. In view of the constant absence of parties, it is presumed that there is no dispute exists between parties. Accordingly, a 'no-dispute' award is rendered in this reference case.

This is my award.

Dated 12-3-1973.

S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-19012/13/72-LRII]

S.O. 978.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs. Madhujore Coal Company Private Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 17th March, 1973.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT

CALCUTTA

Reference No. 34 of 1972

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs. Madhujore Coal Company Private Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan,

AND

Their workmen.

Present :

Sri S. N. Bagchi, Presiding Officer.

Appearances :

On behalf of Employers—None.

On behalf of Workmen—None.

State : West Bengal.

Industry : Coal Mine.

AWARD

By Order No. L/19012/14/72-LR. II dated the 20th May, 1972, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred the following industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs. Madhujore Coal Company Private Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan and their workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, namely :

"Whether the action of the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs. Madhujore Coal Company Private Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan, in stopping Shri Suraj Nath Singh, Mining Sirdar, from work with effect from the 21st June, 1971 and subsequently dismissing him from service with effect from the 2nd December, 1971 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. This case was fixed for admission of the memorandum of compromise filed earlier, if law so permits or for submission of views of parties about the case on 7-3-1973. The case was also fixed for the similar purpose on 22-1-1973 and 9-2-73 but nobody appears from either side though the notices of this Tribunal were duly served upon them.

3. In view of the constant absence of parties, it is presumed that there is no dispute exists between parties. Accordingly, a 'no-dispute' award is rendered in this reference case.

This is my award.

Dated 12-3-1973.

S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer

[No. L-19012/14/72-LR.II.]

between the employers in relation to the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs. The Madhujore Coal Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 17th March, 1973.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL. AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 42 of 1972

Parties:

Employers in relation to the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs. The Madhujore Coal Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan.

AND

Their workmen.

Present:

Sri S. N. Bagchi—Presiding Officer.

Appearances:

On behalf of Employers—None.

On behalf of Workmen—None.

State: West Bengal

Industry: Coal Mine

AWARD

By Order No. L/19012/20/72-LR. II, dated the 28th June, 1972, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, referred the following industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs. The Madhujore Coal Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan and their workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, namely:

"Whether the management of Madhujore Colliery of Messrs The Madhujore Coal Company (Private) Limited, Post Office Kajoragram, District Burdwan is justified in dismissing Shri Balkishun Ahir, Tram-mer with effect from the 13th November, 1971? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. This case was fixed for admission of the memorandum of compromise filed earlier, if law so permits or for submission of views of parties about the case on 7-3-1973. The case was also fixed for the similar purpose on 22-1-1973 and 9-2-1973 but nobody appears from either side though the notices of this Tribunal were duly served upon them.

3. In view of the constant absence of parties, it is presumed that there is no dispute exists between parties. Accordingly, a 'no-dispute' award is rendered in this reference case.

This is my award.

Dated 12-3-1973.

S. N. BAGCHI, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-19012/20/72-LR.II]

S.O. 980.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jealgora Colliery of Messrs the East Indian Coal Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th March, 1973.

S.O. 979.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL (NO. 1), DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 44 of 1971

Parties:

Employers in relation to the Jealgora Colliery of Messrs. The East Indian Coal Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

Present:

Shri D. D. Seth—Presiding Officer.

Appearances:

For the old employers—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate with Shri J. N. P. Sahi, Labour and Law Adviser.

For the Bharat Coking Coal Limited—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate with Shri J. N. P. Sahi, Labour and Law Adviser.

For the Workmen—Shri B. Lal, Advocate.

State: Bihar.

Industry: Coal.

Dhanbad, the 12th March, 1973

AWARD

This is a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and arises out of an order No. L-2012/8/71-LR.II, dated, New Delhi, the 20th August, 1971, passed by the Central Government, Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, in respect of an industrial dispute between the parties mentioned above. The subject matter of the dispute has been specified in the schedule to the said order and runs as follows:

1. "Whether Shri Ram Pratap, Miners' Sirdar of Jealgora Colliery of Messrs. The East Indian Coal Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad, is entitled to 'Sirdari Commission' over the tubs of coal raised by a minimum strength of Miners and loaders. If so, what is that minimum strength and consequently to what relief is the workman entitled?"
2. "Whether refusal of the management of Jealgora Colliery of Messrs East Indian Coal Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad to pay Profit Sharing Bonus under the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 to Shri Ram Pratap. Miners' Sirdar on the tubs raised by the minimum strength of miners-cum-loaders from the year 1969 onwards is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled and since when?"
3. On 29-10-1971 a "statement of claims on behalf of the workmen", was filed in the office of the Tribunal by Shri B. Lal, Vice-President. Colliery Mazdoor Sabha.
4. On 4-11-1971 Shri B. Lal, appearing on behalf of the workmen filed an application praying that the Custodian General and the Custodian be added as parties to the reference and notices were issued to these authorities to show cause why they should not be impleaded as parties as prayed for. On 7-1-1972 Shri J. N. P. Sahi, appearing for both the old employers and the Custodian General filed two written statements, one on behalf of the Custodian General and the other on behalf of the Custodian and prayed for three weeks' time for filing the written statement on behalf of the old employers. On 28-1-1972 Shri S. S. Mukherjee filed a written statement on behalf of the old employers. On 24-3-1972 an application was received from

the Bharat Coking Coal Limited stating that it has no objection to being added as a party and prayed for a months' time for filing a written statement. Accordingly, the Bharat Coking Coal Limited was added as a party in the reference and time was allowed to file its written statement. On 1-5-1972 written statement on behalf of the Bharat Coking Coal Limited was filed.

5. On 30-1-73 some documents were filed both by the management and by the workmen. The documents filed by the employers, on admission, were marked Exts. M1 to M7 and documents filed on behalf of the workmen, on admission, were marked Exts. W1 to W4. On 28-2-73 two further items of documents were filed by Shri B. Lal appearing on behalf of the workmen and on waiver of formal proof those documents were marked Exts. W5 and W6.

6. The workman's case, put briefly, as contained in their statement of claims is that Ram Pratap has been working as a Miners' Sirdar in the colliery concerned for more than 20 years. That formerly he used to work as a loader himself and also as a Miners' Sirdar and as a loader he was getting wages for loading tubs and for working as a Miners' Sirdar he was getting sardari commission at the rate of 0.19 paise per tub of "coal raised" by the miners and loaders working under his supervision. From March, 1966 Ram Pratap was directed by the employers to work only as a Miners' Sirdar and accordingly he devoted his whole time to supervise the work of the miners and loaders. Later on he ceased to work as a loader and stopped loading coal himself for which he was getting wages per tub of coal raised by him. In paragraph 5 of the workmen's written statement it is stated that Ram Pratap has been as a Miners' Sirdar directly under the control and the "management of the employers" and he is paid quarterly bonus as per Coal Mines Bonus Scheme, Leave Wages as per Mines Act, Profit Sharing Bonus as per Payment of Bonus Act and he is a member of Coal Mines Provident Fund. These privilege are allowed only to a working miners' sirdar and not to others. Ram Pratap was required by the management to be present at the colliery to get his attendance marked and he was entitled to receive quarterly bonus and profit sharing bonus and other remuneration only when he put the required minimum number of attendance at the colliery like other employees. The concerned workman was working as a Miners' Sirdar and sardari commission was paid to him and according to the workmen that commission is wage as defined in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The minimum sanctioned strength of miners and loaders allotted to Ram Pratap had all along been 32. This sanctioned strength varied upwards and was not to go below 32 and whenever any occasion arose which caused a short fall in the number of miners and loaders allotted to Ram Pratap, the management was liable to compensate the number of miners and loaders transferring them from other places to work under his sardarship. According to the workmen this was being done to protect his sirdari commission from being reduced "from a minimum". The case of the workman further is that for sometime past the employers deliberately avoided to replace the miners and loaders falling from the minimum strength which caused huge reduction in Ram Pratap's weekly sirdari commission to the extent that sometimes he was only paid Rs. 5 per week. It is also stated in paragraph 10 of the workmen's written statement that the miners and loaders working under Ram Pratap were transferred to other miners' sirdar or in some cases to work under "Sirkari" i.e. directly under the supervision of the colliery management which was in violation of the service conditions of Ram Pratap and which was done only to cause loss to him as regards his sirdari commission. Ram Pratap, according to the workmen, is entitled to receive sirdari commission over tubs of coal raised by a minimum strength of miners and loaders. The minimum strength of miners and loaders has been fixed by various awards even for the lowest category of workmen. The minimum strength of miners and loaders allotted to Ram Pratap has been 32 and he is entitled to that minimum number so that there may not be any reduction in his wages below the minimum. In paragraph 15 of the workmen's written statement it is stated that Ram Pratap has been entrusted to act as a miners' sirdar which work is supervisory in nature and interest of justice requires that in no case "his minimum should be fixed below that of a miner. The Central Wage Board has fixed category IV for miners and loaders and in that view of the matter the category of the concerned workman should be

category V and he should not be allowed "to have minimum wages than that of a workman of category V as per Recommendations of the Central Wage Board already implemented by the management". In paragraph 16 of the workmen's written statement it is stated that employers have been paying profit sharing bonus to Ram Pratap under the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 on imaginary figures in violation of law. The case of the workmen is that the sirdari commission paid to Shri Ram Pratap amounts to wages as per definition given in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and he is also entitled to receive bonus under the Payment of Bonus Act on the basis of sirdari commission.

7. The case of the old management, as contained in its written statement is that both the items which are in dispute in the present reference were the subject matter for decision in an application under section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, being application No. LC.20 of 1970, filed by Ram Pratap before the Central Government Labour Court at Dhanbad and that after contest the Labour Court rejected the contentions of Ram Pratap by an order dated 23-1-1971, and hence the present dispute raised in this reference is barred by the principle of res judicata. According to the old management Ram Pratap was a non-working miners' sirdar in the colliery concerned and there was neither any agreement nor there was any condition of service of Ram Pratap to provide him any fixed minimum strength of miners and loaders. As a non-working miners' sirdar Shri Ram Pratap was getting the commission on the tubs of coal raised by the miners and loaders of his gang and the strength is varied from time to time and since it is not a condition of service of Ram Pratap to provide him with any minimum strength of miners and loaders, no industrial dispute can legally be raised by him in this regard. The management denies that Shri Ram Pratap is entitled to the allotment of the minimum strength of miners and loaders and, as such, the question of fixing the minimum strength does not arise. In paragraph 12 of the old management's written statement it is stated that besides Shri Ram Pratap there are other non-working miners' sirdars and no minimum strength of miners and loaders has been fixed to any one of them. The strength of miners and loaders for these miners' sirdars varied and they received sirdari commission on the basis of number of miners and loaders under their supervision during the week concerned. In regard to the demand of Shri Ram Pratap for payment of Profit Sharing Bonus the case of the old management is that this claim cannot be made the subject matter of adjudication. In paragraph 14 it is stated that since there was no minimum strength of miners-cum-loaders fixed for allotment to Shri Ram Pratap the very basis of the demand as mentioned in item no. 2 of the schedule to the present reference is imaginary and Shri Ram Pratap is not entitled to receive the payment of Profit Sharing Bonus from the year 1969 onwards on the basis of imaginary minimum strength of miners and loaders. According to the old management Ram Pratap is not entitled to any relief on the disputes mentioned in items 1 and 2 of the schedule of the reference.

8. Written statements filed on behalf of the Custodian General and the Custodian are almost identical and their case is that the management of the colliery concerned was taken over by the Government with effect from 17-10-1971 and, as such, the Custodian General and Custodian have no concern with the alleged disputes which is the subject matter of the present reference. They also stated that the Custodian General and Custodian are in no way liable or responsible for any act of the past management prior to the date of taking over of the colliery concerned under the provisions of Coking Coal Mines (Emergency Provisions) Act 1971.

9. A written statement on behalf of the Bharat Coking Coal Co. Limited dated 1-5-1972 has been filed and the case of the Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., is that there did not exist any relationship of employers and employee between it and the workman concerned and, as such, no award can be passed against Bharat Coking Coal Co. Ltd. The Bharat Coking Coal Co. Limited, without prejudice to the above contentions, adopted the written statement filed by the outgoing employers on merits.

10. As is clear from what has been stated above the case of Shri Ram Pratap is that he is a working miners' sirdar. A reference to the working and non-working miners' sirdar can be found in the Colliery Disputes (Arbitration) Award

which is popularly known as the Das Gupta Award. Issues 7 and 8 before Shri Das Gupta related to miners' sirdars and trammers' sirdars and loading sirdars. At page 44 of Das Gupta Award the position of the miners' sirdar is mentioned. The relevant portion at page 44 of Das Gupta Award is as follows:—"The position in respect of the miners' sirdars is a little different. Some of the miners' sirdars work with other members of their respective gangs and some do not. Those who work with the other members of the gang are paid a commission in addition to the wages they earn along with the other members of their respective gangs. Those who do not work are paid only the commission. This commission is related to the production of the members of the respective gangs of the sirdars".

11. According to Das Gupta award Sirdars are in two categories :

- (1) Working, and
- (2) Non-working.

Regarding these two categories of sirdars the relevant observations of Shri Das Gupta are at page 43 of his award and run as follows:—

"The non-working sirdars are paid only commission on the out-put. The working sirdars work along with the members of their respective gangs and earn wages along with the other workers in addition to the commission which were paid to them on the same basis as the other classes of sirdars. The trammers' and loaders' sirdars who work with the members of their respective gangs are paid only a retention allowance in addition to wages they earn along with other members of their gangs".

12. Paragraph 10 at page 46 of the Das Gupta Award is also relevant and runs as follows:—

"In the past the sirdars used to supply labour to the collieries. Colliery labour was migratory in the past and sirdars had to recruit labour and supply labour to the colliery and were paid a commission on the output of their men. The Commission was related to the output of the men of the sirdars, obviously as an inducement to the sirdars to supply hard working men. The sirdars had full control on his men and could withdraw them from collieries at their will. These men have since been absorbed as direct workmen under the collieries. Now with the progress of the welfare activities of the colliery workers, the service conditions have become fairly attractive and there is no longer any necessity to send out men for recruitment of labour as in the past. In the past, these sirdars supervised the work of their men because on the results of their men depended their commission".

13. Paragraph 14 of Das Gupta Award runs as follows:—

"From the evidence on the record I can fairly conclude that of the miners' sirdars, some work with the members of the gangs, and that of those who do not work with the members of the gangs some carry on supervision and some have no activity at all. Of those who carry on supervision, such supervision in some cases are imposed by the management while in other cases it is self-imposed. Those on whom supervision has been imposed by the management should come under the category of working sirdars. It is clear from the letter No. CPF/12, dated 7-5-1951 of the Coalmines Provident Fund Commissioner which excludes non-working sirdars in Coal mines from the Coalmines Bonus Scheme defines the term "working sirdars". Clause (ii) under paragraph 1 of the letter indicates that to be a working sirdar, the sirdar need not do manual work along with other members of his gang. If he actively supervises a gang of not less than 13 workers on the average throughout the bonus period, he will be eligible for bonus as a working sirdar. This letter is appended to this award and marked Appendix E/1. I may accordingly classify the sirdars as indicated below:—

(1) Working sirdars:—

- (a) Those who do manual work with the members of their respective gangs;
- (b) Those who actively supervise a gang of not less than 13 persons on an average.

Supervision contemplated under this clause must be such supervision as has been imposed on the sirdars by the management and brings the sirdar under the control and discipline of the management.

(2) Non-working Sirdars —

- (a) Sirdars who do not work along with the other members of their respective gangs or are not required by the management to carry on any supervisory duties and are not subjected to the control and discipline of the management as indicated in clause 1(b) but do some supervisory work which are self-imposed and are prompted by self-interest to increase the outputs of their respective gangs and their remuneration.
- (b) Sirdars who have no activity, manual or supervisory, imposed by the management or self-imposed who may be called sleeping sirdars".

14. It appears from Das Gupta award that among non-working miners' sirdars there are widows and minors and some were actually working in other capacities, such as shot-firers, switch board attendants, chipping mazdoors and clerks, thus, rendering supervision by them merely a misnomer. Shri Das Gupta held that non-working sirdars and sleeping sirdars have no justification to claim any increase in their sirdari rate. As regards working sirdars as defined by Shri Das Gupta, he held that the sirdari rate which they were getting are sufficient remuneration for the little supervision, if any, they did over their co-workers while working with them and that as such in the case of the working sirdars also sirdari rate did not call for any increment. Shri Das Gupta also pointed out that working miners sirdars are entitled to wages along with other members of his gang.

15. According to the Wage Board Recommendations, as is clear from page 170 of the Recommendations (Vol. I) the Wage Board classified piece rated workers into five groups namely :—

	Basic Wage Rs.	Fall back Wage Rs.
Group I	5.25	5.00
Group II	5.40	5.00
Group III	5.90	5.25
Group IV	6.00	6.00
Group V	6.75	6.00"

The Board recommends the following work-loads for earning their group-wage:

"Pick Miner — I tub of 36 cft. or 36 cft.	} Fixed by Majumdar Tribunal and modified by L.A.T."
Machine Loader — 2 tubs of 36 cft. or 72 cft.	

16. I shall now briefly discuss the oral and documentary evidence produced by the parties.

17. On behalf of the management only one witness namely Shri K. C. Dutta, M.W. 1 was examined. He stated that he has been working in the colliery concerned since November, 1954 and that in 1972 he was promoted as Office Superintendent Labour Personnel Administration. The witness knows Shri Ram Pratap, the concerned workman, whom he described as a non-working miners' sirdar. According to Shri K. C. Dutta the letters "N.W." appearing in the annexure to Ext. M 4 stand for non-working miners' sirdars. Shri K. C. Dutta further stated that the non-working miners' sirdars are paid bonus under the Coal Mines Bonus Scheme only when they supervise a minimum strength of 13 miners and also stated that no minimum number of miners is fixed for the supervision of either Shri Ram Pratap or any other miners' sirdar. Profit Sharing Bonus is paid to the non-working miners' sirdars on the basis of their

compensatory allowance. In cross-examination by Shri B. Lal, appearing on behalf of the workmen Shri K. C. Dutta stated that Shri Ram Pratap has been working as miners' sirdar in the colliery concerned since 1962 and is getting quarterly bonus under the Coal Mines Bonus Scheme even at present and that Coal Mines Provident Fund contribution is deducted from his wages even now and also that he gets Profit Sharing Bonus under the Payment of Bonus Act even now. According to the witness both working and non-working miners' sirdars are eligible to be members of Coal Mines Provident Fund. Shri Dutta further stated that a non-working miners' sirdar is also required to get his attendance marked in the colliery.

18. On behalf of the workmen two witnesses were examined. Shobhnath, W.W. 1 stated that he knows Shri Ram Pratap miners' sirdar in the colliery concerned. The workmen of the colliery get identity card from the company's Labour Office. The witness was shown two identity cards in respect of Shri Ram Pratap and stated that these two identity cards had been signed by the Labour Officer of the Colliery and that the witness recognises his signatures. The two identity cards are marked Ext. W 7 and W 8. Provident Fund Accounts of the employees are mentioned in the two identity cards. Shri Ram Pratap gets quarterly bonus under the Coal Mines Bonus Scheme. In cross-examination by Shri S. S. Mukherjee, appearing on behalf of the management, Shri Shobhnath stated that he was dismissed from the service of the colliery in 1965 and has not been reinstated since then. The witness admitted that Shri Ram Pratap was working previously also as a miner and was getting wages for the same. Shri Shobhnath stated that he did not know if after March, 1966 Ram Pratap has been working as a miners' sirdar.

19. W.W. 2 is the concerned workman Shri Ram Pratap who stated that he is working in the concerned colliery as a miners' sirdar and that he has to present himself in the colliery at 8 O'Clock in the morning and to get his attendance marked and thereafter he gets the attendance of the workmen working under his supervision marked. It is his job to see that the lamps are issued to the workmen work under him. Shri Ram Pratap stated that he gets quarterly bonus under the Coal Mines Bonus Scheme and that Coal Mines Provident Fund contribution is deducted from his wages even now. He also stated that he gets Profit Sharing Bonus also and gets yearly earned leave. In cross-examination by Shri Mukherjee Shri Ram Pratap stated that after March, 1966 he has been working as miners' sirdar only and that he receives commission on the number of miners that work under his supervision at a certain rate. The rate per tub of coal raised by the miners paid to the witness is 0.19 paise, which is the raised rate per tub after the implementation of the Wage Board Recommendations. Previously the rate was 0.15 paise. On a question being put by Shri Mukherjee whether it is a fact that the witness was paid Rs. 1.43 paise per day as compensatory allowance besides the commission the witness answered in the affirmative and stated that he is getting compensatory allowance at the rate of Rs. 1.43 paise per day.

20. Ext. M 1 is a letter addressed by the management to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Dhanbad and is dated 29-3-1971. This exhibit is in relation to the industrial dispute between the management and their workmen over the alleged stoppage of sirdari commission of Shri Ram Pratap, Miners' Sirdar. In Ext. M 1 it is mentioned that in an application (No. L.C. 20 of 1970) filed by Shri Ram Pratap, the non-working miners' sirdar before the Central Government Labour Court, Dhanbad under section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, all the claims now raised by the said Shri Ram Pratap were fully examined and the Labour Court, by its order, dated 23-1-1971 rejected the contentions of Shri Ram Pratap and it is also mentioned that since the contentions of Shri Ram Pratap have already been examined by a judicial authority the same matters cannot be re-opened for discussion now. Ext. M 2 is a letter dated 13-4-1971 addressed by the management to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Dhanbad in regard to the industrial dispute between the management and the workmen regarding the alleged stoppage of sirdari commission of Shri Ram Pratap, Miners' Sirdar and in this letter also it has been stated that the contentions now being raised by Shri Ram Pratap have already been examined by a judicial

authority and, therefore, such matters cannot be re-opened for discussion again. In regard to Exts. M 1 and M 2 it may be stated that although a plea has been taken by the management in its written statement that the present reference is barred by the principle of res-judicata, no argument regarding it was advanced before me by Shri S. S. Mukherjee. Ext. M 3 is a copy of the order dated 23-1-1971 passed by the Central Government Labour Court at Dhanbad on an application filed by Shri Ram Pratap under section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Application No. LC. 20 of 1970). In the application under section 33C(2) Shri Ram Pratap's case was that he was working in two capacities from the period March, 1966 to February, 1970 i.e. he was working as a loader as well as a miners' sirdar and was a working miners' sirdar. Whereas, according to the management Shri Ram Pratap was only a non-working miners' sirdar. In the application under section 33C(2) the Central Government Labour Court at Dhanbad had framed the following three points for determination:—

- “(1) Whether the applicant himself worked as a loader and as such entitled to his wages as claimed by him;
- (2) Whether he is entitled to commission as claimed by him and
- (c) Whether he is entitled to profit sharing bonus for the 3 years as claimed by him.”

21. After discussing the oral and documentary evidence produced by the parties the Central Government Labour Court held that the amount of Rs. 8.58 per week paid to Shri Ram Pratap did not represent any wage but was only compensatory allowance for food and cash which was being paid to him prior to the Das Gupta Award. The Central Government Labour Court further held that from the material before it the inference was clear that Shri Ram Pratap did not do loading work nor had he received wages as a loader from 1966 which fact had been admitted by him and hence the Court held that there was no substance in the case of Shri Ram Pratap that he was entitled to the wages as claimed by him.

22. The Court further held that the commission earned by Shri Ram Pratap was not constant but was fluctuating and hence there was no basis for the case put forth by him that he was allotted the minimum number of 32 miners and loaders and that he was entitled to get commission on the calculation of tubs raised by 32 miners and loaders. The Court came to a finding that there was no substance in the case put forth by Shri Ram Pratap and his claim for commission could not be sustained. As regards the claim of Shri Ram Pratap for Profit Sharing Bonus for the years 1966, 1967 and 1968 at the rate of Rs. 150/- per year, the Central Government Labour Court held that no material had been brought on record on behalf of Shri Ram Pratap to show that he was entitled to Profit Sharing Bonus for the year 1966. As regards the year 1968 it was held the Profit Sharing Bonus of Rs. 32.44 was due to Shri Ram Pratap for that year and he was paid Rs. 32.88. The Court further held that Rs. 32.44 was lying unpaid for the year 1967 and the sum of Rs. 33.88 was paid to him and hence the claim of Shri Ram Pratap for profit sharing bonus for the year 1966 and 1968 could not be sustained. In the result the Central Government Labour Court found that the claim application of Shri Ram Pratap was liable to be dismissed except to the extent of Rs. 32.34 as profit sharing bonus for the year 1967. Ext. M 4 is an important document. It is an office order dated 5-5-1967 and was issued from the Chief Mining Engineer's office of the concerned colliery and relates to miners' sirdars. Paragraph 4 of Ext. M 4 is relevant for the purpose of the present reference and is reproduced as below:—

“The list showing the revised maximum sanctioned complement of loaders/miners of each Sirdar is attached herewith which a sirdar could have at one time depending upon the working conditions (one loader shall be regarded as equivalent to 2 pick miners)”. The annexure to Ext. M 4 is also important. It is a list showing the revised sanctioned complement in respect of the miners sirdars of the concerned colliery with effect from 15-5-1967. In annexure I to Ext. M 4 Shri Ram Pratap's name occurs at Sl. No. 15 and he

shown as “N.W.” i.e. a non-working miners' sirdar with a sanctioned complement of 30 miners. Ext. M 5 is the list of attendance register for the years 1969 to 1971. Ext. M 6 is the sirdari commission sheet for the year 1968 and Ext. M 7 is the sirdari commission sheet for the year 1971.

23. Ext. W1 is dated the 20th September, 1972 and is addressed to Shri Ram Pratap, Miners' sirdar by the sub-area Manager of Bharat Coking Coal Limited. Since Shri B. Lal, appearing for the workmen, has placed great reliance on Ext. W1 it is relevant to quote the contents of Ext. W1 in full. They are as follows:

“You may be aware that the M. C. Loaders under your Sirdarship have been adopting go-slow tactics, as a result the production is suffering very badly in the Jealgora Colliery.

As you know that now this mine belongs to the B.C.C.L. and which is an enterprise of the Government of India and that their demand of daily make up wages can not be met as this is not in line with the recommendations of Coal Wage Board.

You are advised to impress the M. C. Loaders of the correct situation and to impress them to desist from all sorts of illegal and anti-national activities. Please note that if positive result does not come out within 24 hours after receipt of this letter by you, it will be presumed that either you have not done the duty for which you have been paid the commission or that you have no control over the miners.

Please note that in both the eventualities, I would be forced to think seriously that the utility of continuing you as a Sirdar is fruitless and I would accordingly approach the appropriate authorities for terminating your Sirdarship immediately”.

24. Exts. W2, W3 and W4 are leave permits pertaining to Shri Ram Pratap. Ext. W5 is dated 18th December, 1968 and is addressed to Shri Ram Pratap by the Manager of the colliery concerned and it shows that on the date of the exhibit Shri Ram Pratap, Miners' Sirdar was short of 6 pick miners against his sanctioned strength and he was given some pick miners from another pit to work under him with effect from 18th December, 1968. Ext. W6 is a letter dated the 11th October, 1972 and is addressed to Shri Ram Pratap, Miners' Sirdar by the Sub-Area Manager of Bharat Coking Coal Limited. Great reliance on this exhibit has also been placed by Shri B. Lal and hence the contents of this exhibit are reproduced below:—

“We are in receipt of your letter dated the 10th October, 1972.

Please note that in view of your work to impress upon the miners to desist from Go-slow tactics, necessary instruction are being issued to pay your commission.

But you are advised to impress yourself and to impress upon your loaders to follow the grievance procedure and to abide by the Standing Orders in future.

Please also note that your performance as a Miners' Sirdar will be watched for some time, and the utility to retain you as Miners' Sirdar will be reviewed on your future performance”.

25. Exts. W7 and W8 are the identity cards in relation to Shri Ram Pratap, Miners' Sirdar. Ext. W7 is in respect of the quarter ending March, 1971 and gives the provident fund account number of Shri Ram Pratap and Ext. W8 is for the quarter ending March, 1972. This also gives the provident fund account number of Shri Ram Pratap.

26. I shall now deal with the two items of disputes referred to this Tribunal for adjudication by the Central Government.

27. Item No. 1.—Shri B. Lal, appearing on behalf of the workmen, contended that the number of miners and

loaders whose work Ram Pratap had to supervise was fixed by the management at the minimum of 32 and that whenever the number under him fell short of 32 the management was allowing to Shri Ram Pratap such miners who were directly working under the management to maintain the minimum strength of 32. According to Shri B. Lal, with effect from December, 1969 the management started reducing the number of miners and loaders allotted to Shri Ram Pratap with the result that his commission went down. Shri Mukerjee, appearing for the management, denied the case of Shri Ram Pratap and contended that the maximum number of miners allotted to Shri Ram Pratap was 30 and that figure fluctuated from time to time and that Shri Ram Pratap was paid commission on the tubs raised by the actual number of miners working under him. No document has been produced by Shri Ram Pratap to show that the sanctioned strength of miners and loaders working under him was 32. In fact, Shri B. Lal, appearing for the workmen, had to concede before me that there is no document on record to prove what was the minimum attached to the office order, Ext. M4 and at Sl. No. 15 the Pratap. As already stated above Ext. M4 is an office order dated the 5th May, 1967 re-organising the sardari system in the colliery. Paragraph 4 of that office order refers to the list showing the revised maximum sanctioned complement of loaders/miners of each sirdar and also states that one loader shall be regarded as equivalent to two pick miners. A list is attached to the office order, Ext. M4 and at Sl. No. 15 the name of Shri Ram Pratap is mentioned showing that his revised sanctioned complement with effect from 15th May, 1967 was 30 miners. Thus, the 30 miners allotted to Shri Ram Pratap were equivalent to 15 loaders. It has, therefore, not been proved clinchingly that the number allotted to Shri Ram Pratap, vide Ext. M4, was the minimum or that the management was bound to make up the shortage or pay commission on the assumed number of tubs raised by 30 miners, and hence there is no substance in the contention of Shri B. Lal that Shri Ram Pratap was allotted the minimum number of 32 miners and loaders and that he was entitled to commission on the calculation of tubs raised by 32 miners and loaders. The next contention of Shri B. Lal is that Shri Ram Pratap is a working miners' sirdar and works under control and supervision of the management. In this connection Shri B. Lal submitted that no dispute can be raised regarding a non-working miners' sirdar because the management has got no control of supervision over him. A non-working sirdar, according to Shri B. Lal is not a workman, as defined in the Industrial Disputes Act. In support of his contention Shri B. Lal placed great reliance on Exts. W1 and W6 whose contents have been quoted in full above. On the basis of these two exhibits Shri B. Lal contended that Shri Ram Pratap is working under the control and supervision of the management and hence he is a working miners sirdar. Exts. W1 and W6 are dated the 20th September, 1972 and 11th October, 1972 and are documents issued by Bharat Coking Coal Limited i.e. after the colliery had been taken over by the Central Government. These two documents, therefore are of a later date than when the present reference was made to this Tribunal for adjudication. The date of the present reference is 20th August, 1971 i.e. almost a year before the dates of Exts. W1 and W6. The terms of the present reference are for the year 1969 onwards. Hence Exts W1 and W6 cannot be of any help to the concerned workman and it cannot be said that in 1969 Shri Ram Pratap was working miners' sirdar. No material has been placed before this Tribunal to show that in 1969 Shri Ram Pratap was working as a miners' sirdar under the control and supervision of the management. Exts W7 and W8 are the identity cards in respect of Shri Ram Pratap for the years 1971 and 1972 respectively. From these two exhibits we find the commission earned by Shri Ram Pratap during the period when the colliery was taken over by the Central Government. The terms of the present reference are however, for the year 1969 onwards. Even Shri Ram Pratap has deposed that he received commission at the rate of 0.19 paise per day Ext. W7 and W8 show that the commission given to Shri Ram Pratap varied which fact also shows that there was no fixed complement of miners and loaders in case of Shri Ram Pratap.

27. Shri B. Lal appearing for the workmen, conceded that there is no document on record to prove what was the minimum strength of miners in the case of Shri Ram Pratap and hence it must be concluded that Shri Ram Pratap has failed to establish his case of any minimum strength of miners that he was entitled to. Since Shri Ram Pratap has

failed to prove that he was entitled to sirdari commission over the tubs of coal raised by the minimum strength of miners and loaders and since there is no document showing the minimum strength of miners in the case of Ram Pratap it is not possible to fix the minimum strength in his case.

28. Shri K. C. Dutta, M.W. 1 has deposed that no number of miners are fixed for the supervision of either by Ram Pratap or any other miners' sirdars. Shri B. Lal placed reliance on Ext. W5 which was addressed to Shri Ram Pratap by the Manager of the concerned colliery and in which it was stated that it was found that Ram Pratap was short of six pick miners against his sanctioned strength and hence he was given some other pick miners. According to Shri B. Lal other pick miners were given to Ram Pratap only when he had fallen short from the minimum strength that he had to supervise and, therefore, he had to be commensally allotted to Shri Ram Pratap was the minimum or that the management was bound to make up the shortage or pay commission on the assumed number of tubs raised by 30 miners. Shri B. Lal further contended that as a working miners' sirdar and according to Das Gupta Award (page 48 of the award, the minimum strength of Miners under the supervision of Ram Pratap should not have been less than 13 persons on the average. The observations in Das Gupta Award at page 48 to which Shri B. Lal referred to is as follows:—

"If he actively supervises a gang of not less than 13 workers on the average throughout the bonus period, he will be eligible for bonus as a working sirdar".

29. It has already been stated above that there is no document on record to show that Ram Pratap was entitled to any minimum strength of loaders and miners and this position has been conceded by Shri B. Lal appearing for the workmen. This position is further strengthened from Ext. M4 which document was called for from the management by the workmen and paragraph 4 of Ext. M4 which has already been quoted speaks of maximum sanctioned complement which a miners' sirdar could have at one time and that too was to depend on the working conditions which means that the strength was to vary according to the exigency of circumstances. Ram Pratap, W.W.2, when he was examined on behalf of the workmen, himself, does not speak of his being entitled to any minimum strength of miners for supervision work. There is no whisper about any minimum strength in his deposition and hence I am constrained to hold that the workmen have failed to prove their case clinchingly either by oral or documentary evidence about Ram Pratap's entitlement of any minimum strength of workers whose work he had to supervise and also what was that minimum strength.

30. Shri B. Lal next contended that since Ram Pratap was required to get his attendance marked and was also to put eight hours' duty, shows that his work was supervised by the management and, therefore, he is entitled to get the minimum strength of miners and loaders fixed, but according to Shri K. C. Dutta, M.W.1 even non-working miners' sirdars are required to get their attendance marked in the colliery and since the case put forward on behalf of Ram Pratap by Shri B. Lal is that the minimum strength of miners to which Ram Pratap was entitled to is 32 has not been clinchingly proved as there is no documentary evidence about it and this position has already been conceded by Shri B. Lal, there is no force in the contention of Shri B. Lal.

31. The next submission of Shri B. Lal is that since Ram Pratap is required to supervise the work of miners and loaders who are in category IV according to the Wage Board Recommendations he is entitled to get the wages of a workman of category V. I am afraid I cannot go into this question in this reference as I have to confine myself to the terms of reference and I am not required to fix the wages of Ram Pratap in this reference.

32. Shri B. Lal's next contention is that since Ram Pratap was a member of Coal Mines Provident Fund Scheme and was getting Coal Mines Provident Fund, it shows that he was a working miners' sirdar with a fixed minimum strength of miners whose work he has to supervise. According to Das Gupta Award (page 45) even a non-working sirdars can become a working sirdar for the purpose of Coal Mines Bonus Scheme. A non-working sirdar according to Das Gupta award, if he has got a complement of 13 miners will be

deemed to be a working sirdar for the purpose of calculation of bonus (see page 48 of Das Gupta Award). The non-working sirdar, if he supervises the work of not less than 13 miners throughout the period of payment of bonus it to be treated as working sirdar but his nomenclature does not change.

33. From the above discussion I conclude that the workmen have failed to establish that Ram Pratap was entitled to any minimum strength of miners and hence the question of fixing that minimum strength in his case does not arise.

34. **Item No. 2**—In connection with this item of schedule of the reference Shri B. Lal contended that it is an admitted fact that Ram Pratap had been paid profit sharing bonus under the Payment of Bonus Act which the management had been paying to him not on commission received by Ram Pratap was entitled to receive profits sharing bonus from 1969 onwards. According to Shri B. Lal commission received by Shri Ram Pratap amounted to wages under the Payment of Bonus Act and in this connection Shri B. Lal referred to section 10 of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 which reads as follows:—

"10. Subject to the provisions of sections 8 and 13, every employer shall be bound to pay to every employee in an accounting year at minimum bonus which shall be four per cent of the salary or wage earned by the employee during the accounting year or forty rupees, whichever is higher, whether there are profits in the accounting year or not :

Provided that where such employee has not completed fifteen years of age at the beginning of the accounting year, the provisions of this section shall have effect in relation to such employee as if for the words "forty rupees", the words "twenty-five rupees" were substituted".

35. Relying upon section 10 Shri B. Lal contended that the management was not justified in not taking into the account the commission paid to Ram Pratap in order to decide the question of profit sharing bonus to him.

36. In support of the above contention in regard to item no. 2 of the schedule of reference Shri B. Lal placed reliance on a judgment of the Supreme Court in Bhagaband Colliery and their workmen reported in 1962 (II) L.L.J. page 356 at page 359, where their Lordships of the Supreme Court observed is as follows:—

"What was paid to the respondents was no doubt commissions at the rate of 3 pice per tub raised by the miners and a sirdar of Rs. 2 per 100 tugs. According to the definition of "wages" in the Act, all remuneration "capable of being expressed in terms of money" payable to a workman in respect of his employment or for the work done in such employment would mean wages. The commission payable to sirdars being expressed in terms of money thus falls within the definition".

37. Bhagaband's case was in regard to "wages" as defined in the Industrial Disputes Act. In the instant reference we are concerned with the definition of "wages" as defined in the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 which is different from the definition given in the Industrial Disputes Act. Section 2(21) of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 defines salary or wage and reads as follows:—

"(21) "salary or wage" means all remuneration (other than remuneration in respect of over-time work) capable of being expressed in terms of money, which would, if the terms of employment, express or implied, were fulfilled, be payable to an employee in respect of his employment or of work done in such employment and includes dearness allowance (that is to say, all cash payments, by whatever name called, paid to an employee on account of a rise in the cost of living), but does not include—

- (i)
- (ii)
- (iii)
- (iv)
- (v)
- (vi)
- (vii) any commission payable to the employee.

Explanation.—Where an employee is given in lieu of the whole or part of the salary or wage payable to him, free food allowance or free food by his employer, such food allowance or the value of such food shall, for the purpose of this clause, be deemed to form part of the salary or wage of such employee."

38. According to section 2(21) of the Payment of Bonus Act salary or wage does not include any commission payable to the employee and according to the explanation in section 2 sub-section 21 of the Payment of Bonus Act, Ram Pratap is entitled to bonus on free food allowance which, in the instant case admittedly is Rs. 1.43.

39. Section 2 sub-section 22 of the Payment of Bonus Act is also important and reads as follows :

"(22) words and expressions used but not defined in this Act and defined in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) shall have the meanings respectively assigned to them in that Act".

40. Accordingly since the term wage has been defined in the Payment of Bonus Act, we do not have to look at the definition of "wages" in the Industrial Disputes Act which was done in Bhagaband case and hence the Supreme Court decision in Bhagaband case is distinguishable.

41. The decision on item no. 2 of the schedule of reference is dependent on the question whether Shri Ram Pratap was entitled to a fixed minimum strength of miners to supervise their work and if he was not entitled to any minimum strength, the question of payment of bonus under the Payment of Bonus Act per tub on marginal basis does not arise.

42. It is in evidence in the present reference that daily compensatory allowance was paid to Shri Ram Pratap at Rs. 1.43 per day, this allowance was in lieu of food grain concession which the workman was getting. Profit Sharing Bonus was being paid on this compensatory allowance which was in lieu of food-grain concession which shows that the management was not paying Ram Pratap profit sharing bonus or any commission as claimed by him. The award in respect of item no. 2 cannot be based on surmises and conjecture and has to be based on oral and documentary evidence. Since there is no evidence that Ram Pratap was entitled to any minimum strength of miners, item no. 2 of the schedule of reference does not arise. Bhagaband's case, on which reliance has been placed by Shri B. Lal, has no application to the facts in the present case as the question of working sirdars and non-working sirdars was not received in that case before the Supreme Court and there was no determination as to who is a working sirdar and who is a non-working sirdar. The Bhagaband case dealt with the cases of contractors and workmen.

43. For the reasons mentioned above my award is that Shri Ram Pratap, Miners' Sirdar of Jealgora Colliery of M/s. East Indian Coal Co. Ltd., P.O. Jealgora, (Dhanbad), is not entitled to sirdari commission over the tubs of coal raised by the minimum strength of miners and loaders. The second part of item no. 1 of the schedule of reference does not arise and the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

44. As regards second item of the schedule of reference my award is that the refusal of the management of Jealgora Colliery of M/s. East Indian Coal Co. Ltd., P.O. Jealgora, (Dhanbad) to pay profit sharing bonus under the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 to Shri Ram Pratap, Miners' Sirdar on the tubs raised by the minimum strength of miners-cum-loaders from the year 1969 onwards was justified. The concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

45. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Central Government under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

D. D. SETH, Presiding Officer

[No. L-2012/80/71-LRII]

KARNAIL SINGH, Under Secy.

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 22nd March, 1973

S.O. 981.—In the order No. S.O. 244, dated the 19th January, 1973 published on pages 341 and 342 in Part II Section 3 Sub-Section (ii) of the Gazette of India dated the 27th January, 1973 for "section 7A" read "section 7".

[No. S. 11025/18/72-LR.]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 मार्च, 1973

का. आ. 982.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स विक्टरी इंजीनियरिंग कम्पनी, एफ-88, गार्डन रीच रोड, कलकत्ता-24 के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह और राय है कि उक्त विवाद इस प्रकृति का है कि उक्त विवाद से मैसर्स फ्रेंड्स इंजीनियरिंग कम्पनी, कलकत्ता, का हितबद्ध या प्रभावित होना संभाव्य है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) और उपधारा (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए एतद्वारा निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

(1) क्या मैसर्स विक्टरी इंजीनियरिंग कम्पनी, एफ-88 गार्डन रीच रोड, कलकत्ता-24 और मैसर्स फ्रेंड्स इंजीनियरिंग कम्पनी, कलकत्ता के प्रबन्धतंत्र ने निम्नलिखित 13 कर्मचारों को 1-9-1972 से रोजगार देने से इंकार कर दिया है। यदि ऐसा है तो सम्बन्धित कर्मकार किए अनुशोध के हकदार हैं ?

1. श्री जमाल
2. श्री असफ
3. श्री हाफिस
4. श्री अलाउद्दीन
5. श्री कल्लू
6. श्री मुन्ना (सं. 1)
7. श्री मुन्ना (सं. 2)
8. श्री मोहम्मद सलीम
9. श्री मोहम्मद निशर
10. श्री शमीम (सं. 1)
11. श्री शमीम (सं. 2)
12. श्री रहत
13. श्री इंसान

(2) क्या उपरवर्णित 13 कर्मचारों की उनकी प्रतिदिन मजदूरी की वरों में वृद्धि की मांग न्यायोचित है? यदि हां तो, वे किस अनुशोध के और किस तारीख से हकदार हैं ?

[सं. एल.-32011/22/72-पी.एण्ड.डी.]

वी. संकरालिंगम्, अवर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd March, 1973

S.O. 982.—WHEREAS the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Victory Engineering Company, F-88, Garden Reach Road, Calcutta-24 and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule annexed;

AND, WHEREAS, the Central Government is further of opinion that the said dispute is of such a nature that Messrs. Friends Engineering Company, Calcutta, are likely to be interested in or affected by the said dispute;

AND, WHEREAS, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (5) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Whether the management of Messrs Victory Engineering Company, F. 88, Garden Reach Road, Calcutta-24 and Messrs Friends Engineering Company, Calcutta, have denied employment to the following 13 workmen from 1st September, 1972? If so, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?

1. Shri Jamal.
2. Shri Asraf.
3. Shri Hafiz.
4. Shri Allauddin
5. Shri Kallu.
6. Shri Munna (No. 1)
7. Shri Munna (No. 2)
8. Shri Md. Salim.
9. Shri Md. Nishar.
10. Shri Shamim (No. 1).
11. Shri Shamim (No. 2).
12. Shri Rahat.
13. Shri Insan.

- (2) Whether the demand of the 13 workmen mentioned above for increase in their daily wage rates is justified? If so, to what relief are they entitled and from which date?

[No. L-32011/22/72-P & D]

V. SANKARALINGAM, Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 23 मार्च, 1973

क्रा० प्रा० 983.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट कारखानों को उक्त अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट महाराष्ट्र राज्य के ऐसे क्षेत्रों में, जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त नहीं हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए उक्त कारखानों को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5-क के अधीन उद्योगहीन नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से, इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या तब तक के लिए जब तक कि उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उन क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त नहीं हो जाते जो भी पहले हो, एतद्वारा छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	जिले का नाम	क्षेत्र का नाम	कारखाने का नाम
1	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	कोल्हापुर	जबसिहपुर	मैसर्स नेशनल डाईंग एण्ड ब्लैचिंग वर्क्स।
2.	थाना	पालघर	मैसर्स शामला इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स।
3.	शोलापुर	अकलकोट	मैसर्स लक्ष्मी वेंकटेश प्रोसेस।
4.	कोलाबा	महद	मैसर्स दि कॉमनवेल्थ ट्रस्ट लिमिटेड।

[सं० एस-38014(29)/72-एच आई]

New Delhi, the 23rd March, 1973

S. O. 983.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government, having regard to the location of the factories specified in column (4) of the Schedule hereto annexed in areas specified in column (3) of the said Schedule in the State of Maharashtra in which the provisions of Chapters IV and V of the said Act are not in force, hereby exempts the said factories from the payment of employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a period of one year from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette or until the enforcement of provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in those areas, whichever is earlier.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Name of District	Name of area	Name of the factory
1	2	3	4
1.	Kolhapur	Jaisingpur	Messrs National Dyeing and Bleaching Works.
2.	Thana	Palghar	Messrs Shamla Engineering Works.
3.	Sholapur	Akalkot	Messrs Laxmi Venkatesh Process.
4.	Kolaba	Mahad	Messrs The Commonwealth Trust Limited.

[No. S-38014/(29)/72-HI]

क्रा० प्रा० 984.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट कारखानों को उक्त अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्दिष्ट गोवा, दमन और दीव संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के ऐसे क्षेत्रों में, जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त नहीं हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए उक्त कारखानों को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5-क के अधीन उद्योगहीन नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से, इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या तब तक के लिए जब तक कि उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उन क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त नहीं हो जाते, जो भी पहले हो, एतद्वारा छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	जिले का नाम	क्षेत्र का नाम	कारखाने का नाम
1	2	3	4
1.	गोवा	ओपाबांडेवर	मैसर्स ओपा वाटर वर्क्स।
2.	गोवा	तिविम (बारडेंज)	मैसर्स ओडियम ड्राई डॉक।
3.	गोवा	मासॅल (खंडोला)	मैसर्स जैन शिपिंग एण्ड शिपबिल्डर्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड।

दलजीत सिंह, अवसर सचिव

[सं० एस-38014(29)/72-एच आई]

S. O. 984.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government, having regard to the location of the factories specified in column (4) of the Schedule hereto annexed in areas specified in column (3) of the said Schedule in the Union territory of Goa, Daman and Diu in which the provisions of Chapters IV and V of the said Act are not in force, hereby exempts the said factories from the payment of employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a period of one year from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette or until the enforcement of provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in those areas, whichever is earlier.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Name of District	Name of area	Name of the factory
1.	Goa	Opakhandepar	Messrs Opa Water Works.
2.	Goa	Tivim (Bardez)	Messrs Bodiom Dry Dock.
3.	Goa	Marcel (Khandola)	Messrs Jain Shipping and Ship Builders Private Limited.

[No. S-38014(29)/72-HI]

DALJIT SINGH, Under Secy.

